

THE
JOURNAL
OF THE
//7
ANTHROPOLOGICAL INSTITUTE
OF
GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND.



VOL. XI.

LONDON:
PUBLISHED FOR
The Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland
BY
TRÜBNER & CO., 57 & 59, LUDGATE HILL.

All Rights Reserved.

1882.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
I. Note on Carib Chisels. By J. FORTÉ, Esq.	2
II. Notes on two Stone Circles in Shropshire. By A. L. LEWIS, Esq., F.C.A., M.A.I.	3
III. Surgery and Superstition in Neolithic Times. By Miss A. W. BUCKLAND, M.A.I.	7
IV. Notes on the Origin of the Malagasy.] By C. STANILAND WAKE, Esq., M.A.I.	21
V. The Gauchos of San Jorge, Central Uruguay. By DAVID CHRISTISON, M.D., Edinburgh	34
VI. Note on Platform-Dwellings in Assam. By S. E. PEAL, Esq.	53
VII. Notes on the Wild Tribes inhabiting the so-called Naga Hills, on our North-East Frontier of India. Part I. By Lieu- tenant-Colonel R. G. WOODTHORPE, R.E.	56
VIII. On a Collection of Monumental Heads and Artificially Deformed Crania, from the Island of Mallicollo, in the New Hebrides. By W. H. FLOWER, LL.D., F.R.S., P.Z.S., V.P. Anthropol. Inst.	75
IX. Notes on the Western Regions. Translated from the "Ts'ên Han Shoo," Book 96, Part II. By A. WYLIE, Esq.	83
X. Report on Bones found in a Roman Villa at Morton, near Brading, April, 1881. By Professor W. H. FLOWER, F.R.S.	116
XI. Remarks on some Archaic Structures in Somersetshire and Dorsetshire. By A. L. LEWIS, Esq., F.C.A., M.A.I.	117
XII. On a New Instrument for determining the Facial Angle. By G. M. ATKINSON, Esq., M.A.I.	122
XIII. The Stone Age of South Africa. By W. D. GOOCH, Esq., C.E., M.A.I.	124
XIV. Notes on the Wild Tribes inhabiting the so-called Naga Hills, on our North-East Frontier of India. Part II. By Lieutenant-Colonel R. G. WOODTHORPE, R.E.	196
XV. On some Naga Skulls. By GEORGE D. THANE, Professor of Anatomy in University College, London	215

	PAGE
XVI. The Spread of the Slaves. Part IV. The Bulgarians. By H. H. HOWORTH, Esq., F.S.A., M.A.I.	219
XVII. On the Andamanese and Nicobarese Objects presented to Major-General Pitt Rivers, F.R.S. By E. H. MAN, Esq., F.R.G.S., M.R.A.S., M.A.I.	268
XVIII. Description of Andamanese Bone Necklaces. By Dr. ALLEN THOMSON, F.R.S., V.P. Anthrop. Inst.	295
XIX. On the Laws affecting the Relations between Civilized and Savage Life, as bearing on the Dealings of Colonists with Aborigines. By the Right Hon. Sir H. BARTLE FRERE, Bart., G.C.B., G.C.S.I., F.R.S.	313
XX. On the Animism of the Indians of British Guiana. By EVERARD F. IM THURN, Esq.	360
XXI. On the Discovery of Chert Implements in Stratified Gravel in the Nile Valley near Thebes. By Major-General PITT RIVERS, F.R.S., President Anthrop. Inst.	382
XXII. Notes on the Asiatic Relations of Polynesian Culture. By EDWARD B. TYLOR, D.C.L., F.R.S., V.P. Anthrop. Inst.	401
XXIII. On Fijian Riddles. By the Rev. LOBIMER FISON, M.A.	406
XXIV. On the Stature of the Inhabitants of Hungary. By JOHN BEDDOE, M.D., F.R.S., M.A.I.	410
XXV. Some Vestiges of Girl Sacrifices, Jar Burial, and Contracted Interments in India and the East. By M. J. WALHOUSE, Esq., F.R.A.S., M.A.I.	415
XXVI. On the Origin and Primitive Home of the Semites. By G. BERTIN, Esq., M.A.I.	423
XXVII. Notes on some Excavations made in Tumuli near Copiapó, Chili, in June, 1880. By J. H. MADGE, Esq.	437
XXVIII. On some Stone Implements from British Guiana. By E. F. IM THURN, Esq.	444
XXIX. On Sepulchral Remains at Rathdown, Co. Wicklow. By GERARD A. KINAHAN, Esq.	452
XXX. On Excavations in the Earthwork called Dane's Dyke at Flamborough in October, 1879; and on the Earthworks of the Yorkshire Wolds. By Major-General PITT RIVERS, F.R.S., P.A.I.	455
XXXI. Account of the Discovery of Six Ancient Dwellings, found under and near to British Barrows, on the Yorkshire Wolds. By J. R. MORTIMER, Esq., M.A.I.	472
Annual General Meeting	479

This table also brings to light some points of difference between the two groups in the index of height, in the orbital index, and especially in the nasal index. In reference to the last feature, however, it may be remarked that there is a considerable range of variation within the series of Chinese skulls, and while the tendency undoubtedly is towards the narrow form of nose, and there are some which agree closely with our skull A, both in the nasal index and in the prominence of the nasal bones, there are, among the eighteen, four which are to a greater or less extent platyrrhine; and of these, one, No. 691 may be particularly mentioned, since it has a nasal index of 58·7, thus equalling our little group of B, D, and E (the skull shows altogether a great resemblance to D and E), and this is associated with an extremely low orbital index, viz., 75.

Thus a platyrrhine form of skull with a microsome orbital index is not unknown, at least in individual cases, in an undoubtedly Mongolian family, but the question whether this is the prevailing condition amongst the inhabitants of the Naga Hills must remain to be settled by further observations.

The measurements in the appended table have been made in the manner recommended by Professor Flower, to whose kind assistance I am mainly indebted for the opportunity of making this communication. A full explanation of the terms and methods employed, in so far as they differ from the French "*Instructions*," is contained in Professor Flower's memoir already cited, "*On the Cranial Characters of the Natives of the Fiji Islands.*"

THE SPREAD *of the* SLAVES.—PART IV.

THE BULGARIANS.

By H. H. HOWORTH, Esq., F.S.A., M.A.I.

THE term Bulgaria has a twofold connotation which it is very necessary that we should keep constantly in view. There is a political Bulgaria, and an ethnographical Bulgaria. These two are essentially different in boundaries and otherwise. The former includes all the country which was subject to the Bulgarian Crown in the days of its greatest prosperity, the latter includes the area peopled by Bulgarians properly so called. The boundaries which separate them are not always easy to fix, for we must remember that, although the Bulgarians are a mixed race of Slaves and Turco-Ugrians, yet that in their language and other more readily discriminated characteristics they have

retained but few traces of the latter element in their composition, which has been absorbed by their former one. So that superficially the Slaves of Macedonia or Rumelia and the Bulgarians of Bulgaria proper north of the Balkans are now very nearly related indeed. So nearly related, that if the question of nationality is to govern the solution of political problems, it seems pedantic to separate them when we are treating the problem, not as one of ethnology, but as one of politics.

This, however, is complicated by another difficulty. It is comparatively easy to draw a line which shall separate the Slaves of Macedonia and Thrace from the litoral population which, whatever its mixed origin, is chiefly Greek or Turkish in language. It is similarly not difficult to define the corresponding boundary between the Macedonian Slaves and the Albanians. North of the Balkans, the problem is a more difficult one. If we accept the position, that whatever was subject to the Bulgarian Crown in the days of the Tzar Simeon, is to be included within the limits of Bulgaria, we must detach from Servia a very considerable area, and carry our boundary at least as far west as the Ibar and the Morava, and not merely to the Timok as is generally supposed. But letting this pass as one of the difficulties which prevent the recreation of the Bulgaria of Michael Boris and of Simeon in its integrity, and which has to be solved by a compromise involving a sacrifice on the part of Bulgaria, it will not be unprofitable to try and define the limits of this political Bulgaria towards the west and south. Accepting the test of language, and the postulate that pretty nearly all Slaves south of the Balkans were (as I believe they were) subject to the Tzar Simeon, we may accept the boundary line as fixed by the treaty of Saint Stephano as giving a very fair representation of the facts. This line no doubt errs on the side of including too little, for there can be very little doubt that, as we shall show in the next paper, even in Thessaly in the centuries preceding the 12th, there was a large element of Slavic origin, which has been absorbed by the more civilised Greeks. This boundary, however, represents very fairly the limits of what we may style Political Bulgaria. It has been admirably drawn in map 11a of Petermann's "*Mittheilungen*" for 1878. By Article 6 of the treaty of St. Stephano, the boundaries of the proposed Bulgaria, commencing with the north-eastern corner of the rectified frontier of Servia followed the eastern boundary of the Kaza Wrania district as far as the range of Karatagh, then bending south-westwards, ran along the eastern boundary of the Kazas of Kumanovo, Kotshani, and Kalkandelen as far as the mountain Korab, and thence along

the river Weleshchitza until its junction with the Black Drin. Then turning southwards following the Drin, and along the western verge of the Kaza Okhrid towards Mount Linas, then following the western limits of the Kazas of Gortcha and Starovo, as far as the mountain Grammos. Thence it passed by the Lake of Kastoria. The frontier then joined the river Moglenitza, and following its course south of Yanitsa to its outfall into the *Ægean*, past the mouth of the river Wardar to Galliko, past the villages of Parga and Saraikoi. Thence through the centre of the lake Beshikgol, and on again to the sea, thus cutting off the peninsula of Salonica, then along the coast past the mouths of the Struma and the Karasu as far as Burugol. Then turning to the north-west to the mountain Chaltepe, crossing the range of Rhodope to the mountain Krushovo, past the Kara Balkan, the peaks Eshek-Kulatshi, Chepelii, Karakolas, and Ishiklar to the river Arta. Thence past the town of Chirmen, leaving Adrianople on the south, past the villages of Sugutliu, Karahamza, Arnautkoi, Akardshhi and Yenidshe to the river Tekederessi, following the course of the Tekederessi and the Chorluderessi as far as Luleburgas and thence past the river Sudshakdere to the village of Sergen, whence the line went in a straight line to Hakim-tabiassi where it reached the Euxine.

Such was the boundary of Bulgaria towards Turkey, as fixed by the treaty of St. Stephano. East and north of this limit, with the exception of some sporadic colonies of Vlakhs and gipseys, and of a certain partial element of Turkish and Circassian blood, the population is tolerably homogeneous in language, religion, and manners. I say tolerably homogeneous, meaning sufficiently so to satisfy political exigencies.

Ethnologically the population here referred to is not so homogeneous. As is well known, European Turkey was during the sixth century overrun by various Slavic tribes who settled there in great numbers, and extended their colonisation, in fact, as far as the Morea. This migration of Slaves will occupy us in the next paper of this series. Suffice it to say here that its result was that Mœsia and Thrace became virtually Slave countries, as they so largely are still.

This earlier migration, as I shall show in the next paper, took place chiefly under the leadership of Huns and Avars. It was when Mœsia was in this way settled by Slaves, and while the empire (especially its possessions on the Adriatic), was being devastated by the Avars that the Emperor Heraclius invited a body of Slaves led by Bulgarians, who were called Khrobati (*vide infra.*), to attack the latter, and allowed them to settle in Croatia. Shortly after, the Sabiri, another Hunnic race closely allied to the Bulgars, also settled south of the Danube under the auspices of

the Emperor, and as I believe secured all the country south-east of the Croats, and as far as the Euxine, so that the districts north of the Balkans became virtually divided between the Croats in the west and the Sabiri or Serbians in the east. This was about the years 630–640. About forty years later the Bulgarian Huns, driven forward by the Khazars, migrated in large numbers across the Danube, conquered the greater portion of the area already subject to the Sabiri, pushed the dominions of the latter back beyond the Morava, and founded the community which is now known as Bulgaria. The invaders were a caste of conquerors and became the proprietors of the land and the rulers of the new community, while the peasantry remained Slavic. This we shall show presently. The Bulgaria thus originally constituted was bounded on the east by the Euxine, on the south by the Balkans, and on the west by the Morava, and this may be described as ethnographic Bulgaria.

It was by no means homogeneous, as we shall show. The Bulgarian element proper, *i.e.*, the Hunnic element, prevailed chiefly in the Dobruja, and became weaker towards the Balkans and the Morava. It is with this settlement of the Bulgarians south of the Danube that our story properly begins. The various *raids* of Huns, Avars, and also of Bulgars south of the Danube, which took place before this settlement, and were for the most part merely temporary, we shall describe in a future paper.

When about the years 457–461 the Avars first appear in the Byzantine historians, we find them described as having driven forward the Saraguri, Urogi and Unnugari, and as having expelled the Sabiri from their former quarters. These tribes then settled in various parts of the old Hunnic land from the Carpathians to the Caucasus, the Sabiri chiefly settling north of the latter mountains. A hundred years later the Sarselt, the Unnugari, and Sabiri were again attacked by the Avars, who were then being pushed forward by the Turks, and who now migrated westwards as far as Pannonia, taking with them no doubt large contingents of these tribes, and thenceforward for many years it would seem that the Avars dominated over not only Pannonia, but also over the various Hunnic tribes of southern Russia, including the Sabiri and the Unnugari.

In a paper of the series on the westerly drifting of Nomades, I have already discussed the nationality of the Bulgars, and shown that they belonged to the Hunnic race, and were, in fact, Huns under another name. Since writing that paper I have met with some fresh information which enables me to specify more definitely the actual affinities of the race. I suggested in

the former memoir, that the Cheremisses are *probably* the descendants of the Bulgars, who founded the famous state of Great Bulgaria on the Middle Volga. This view I must now modify. In looking over the pages of Nestor, the Russian annalist, I find that he speaks of the Cheremisses and of the Bulgarians as separate peoples living at the same time. The Prince of the Cheremisses, in fact, assisting the Russians in their attack on Bulgaria (Nestor sub. ann. 1184, Ed. Paris, ii, 150).

Putting aside the Cheremisses, the only race on the Volga which has claims to represent the ancient Bulgars is that of the Chuvashes, and the latest Russian researches, especially those of M. Kunik, in his notes to Al Bekhri, make it very nearly certain that the Chuvashes in fact descend from the ancient Bulgars. The Chuvashes now speak a corrupt Turkish dialect, but all inquirers who have examined the question of their ethnology closely are agreed that this Turkish element is comparatively of recent origin, due probably to their having been so long in close contact with, and subject to, the Tartars. In physique, in manners, and customs, and in other respects the Chuvashes are Ugrians, and traces of their Ugrian origin survive, in fact, in their language. They represent, as I believe, most purely, except in their present Turkish speech, the Huns and Bulgars of the fifth and six century.

Let us now turn to our immediate subject; we have seen how the various Hunnic tribes were conquered by the Avars in the middle of the sixth century. It would seem that, although the Avars exercised a certain suzerainty over them, they preserved a separate organisation, and even claimed to elect a supreme Khan sometimes, and we read in the pages of the Frank chronicler Fredegar how, in the year 630, there arose a great commotion in Pannonia about the election of a king as to whether he should be an Avar or a Bulgarian. The rival parties fought together, and the Bulgarians were beaten, and 9,000 of them who had been expelled from Pannonia with their wives and children, went to Dagobert, the Frank king, and asked him to grant them a settlement within the Frank borders. Dagobert ordered winter quarters to be assigned them in Bavaria, which was accordingly done. When they were scattered about in quarters in this way, Dagobert, by the advice of the Franks, ordered the Bavarians that they should set upon and kill their guests; they accordingly did so, and none of the Bulgarians escaped, except Alticeus, or Alticcus, who with 700 men, women, and children, escaped to the March of the Winidi or Wends. He lived with Walluk, the chief of the Wends, for many years (Fredegar, c. 72; Zeuss, 716, 717). It is very probable, as Zeuss suggested, that this Alticeus is the Alzec, chief of the

Bulgarians mentioned by Paulus Diaconus, who tells us that a Bulgarian chief named Alzec, for some unknown cause, left his people, and went to Italy with all his army, to King Grimoald, promising to serve him and to settle in his country. He directed him to go to his son, Romoald, at Beneventum, whom he ordered to find him a place to settle in. Romoald gladly received him, and gave him the districts of Sepianum, Bovianum, and Iserniam, in the mountains east of Naples (which at that time were unoccupied), with other lands. Paul adds that although in his day these colonists spoke Latin, yet they had not forgotten their mother tongue (P. D., v. 29; Zeuss, 717). Grimoald reigned from 661 till 670.

Let us revert again to the statement of Fredegar. I have very little doubt that the outbreak he mentions is the same described by Nicephorus, who in his notice of the reign of Heraclius, tells us that Kubrat, the cousin of Organa (? Urkhan) the ruler of the Hunnogunduri, rebelled against the Khakan of the Avars, drove out the people whom he had received from him, and afterwards sent an embassy to make peace with Heraclius, which lasted during their joint lives. Heraclius made him presents and gave him the title of Patrician (Stritter, ii, 501).

The explanation of the apparent contradiction between Fredegar and Nicephorus I take to be this. When Kubrat rebelled against the Avars, he became the ruler of the various hordes of Huns proper, extending from Pannonia to the Don, including possibly Transylvania and Wallachia, but the Avars succeeded in ejecting his supporters from Pannonia, which together with Illyria and the land west of the Morava, thenceforward became the Avar country proper.

It was a frequent custom with the Hunnic hordes to take their names from some noted leader, and it is therefore exceedingly probable that on their great outbreak the followers of Kubrat should have called themselves Kubrati, that is, Croats. I have argued in a previous paper of this series that the Croats or Khrobati of Croatia were so called from a leader named Kubrat or Khrubat. I would add here an addition to what I have there said, viz., that the native name of the Croats, given variously as Hr-wati, Horwati, cannot surely be a derivative of Khrebet, a mountain chain, as often urged, but is clearly the same as the well known man's name Horvath, familiar to the readers of Hungarian history and no doubt the equivalent of the Khrubat or Kubrat of the Byzantine writers, which name is given by them not only to the stem father of the Bulgarian kings, but to one of the five brothers who led the Croat migration.

I have also shown in previous papers of this series, that the

Croats were led by a caste of Hunnic race. These facts are very curious, and make it *à priori* not improbable that they may have taken their names from Kubrat, the leader of the Bulgarian revolt himself, and were in fact his subjects. Now on turning to the first time that we find mention of the Croats, which unfortunately is contained in the writings of Constantine Porphyrogenitus, who wrote in the tenth century, and therefore three centuries after the event, we read that Heraclius, being much distressed by the way in which the Avars were devastating Dalmatia, made overtures to some princes of the Krobati, offering them if they drove out the Avars from that district to allow them to settle there. They accordingly marched under five brothers, one of whom was called *Kubrat*, conquered the Avars in Illyria, and occupied the country. These Khrobati can surely be no others than the subjects of Kubrat the Patrician. It is exceedingly probable that at this time Mœsia was practically lost to the empire. We must remember that Kubrat, who doubtless dominated over Wallachia and its borders, was at deadly issue with the Avars, as we have seen, but was, on the other hand, on friendly terms with Heraclius. The latter would, therefore, naturally appeal to him for help, and there does not seem to be another solution available, for we must remember that the Avars were then masters of Pannonia. I showed in the last paper the great improbability that the Croats, who were in alliance with Heraclius, should have gone to him from the Carpathians. They were doubtless close neighbours of the empire when invited to attack the Avars, and in order to succeed against such a powerful race as the latter, must have been a strong nation, and not a mere handful of people fleeing from the Carpathians, nor does the narrative of the Byzantine author in fact demand this. He merely says the Croats who settled in Croatia came from the same stock, *i.e.*, belonged to the same race as the Croats of White Croatia.

The view here urged is confirmed in other ways; the five brothers who led the Croats seem to answer to the five sons of Kubrat, to whom we shall refer presently. Again, when the latter divided their father's heritage, one of them is said to have settled with his people in Pannonia. This exactly accords with the tradition about the Croats, which tells us that when they had occupied Dalmatia, one section of them separated from the rest, and moved into Pannonia. This section founded a separate principality there which I described in the paper on the Croats.

Let us now prosecute this clue somewhat further. We have seen how in all directions where we have traced them, the southern Slaves were led by a caste of Hunnic race. The case of the Serbs

I treated as somewhat doubtful, when writing about them, but I am now convinced that they formed no exception at all, and were as much as the other south-western Slaves led by Hunnic leaders. The name Serb has been a *crux* to every inquirer into Slavic ethnography. It occurs in the form Serbi, Sorabi, Severi, &c. Now it is very strange that one of the three main divisions of the Huns, as we have seen was called Sabiri, and these Sabiri occur frequently in the history of the beginning of the seventh century. Like the other Huns they were conquered by the Avars in the year 558, and afterwards by the Bulgars. What is more interesting is to find the Sabiri named as the allies of Heraclius in his wars with the Persians. It is not strange, therefore, they should have turned to him again at the time of the great upheaval in the Avarian empire, which we have mentioned, and thus it came about that shortly after the Croats had expelled the Avars from Dalmatia, the Sabiri or Serbs also went and asked Heraclius for quarters. He settled them eventually, as I have shown, in Mœsia, to the east of the Croats. As I now believe, their original settlement probably included the greater part of Bulgaria, as well as Serbia proper, and when the Bulgars finally settled south of the Danube in 678, we are expressly told that they subdued the Seberiei or Seberenses, who occupied the country from the Balkan Pass, (called that of the Beregabi), eastward as far as the marshes, *i.e.*, the marshes of the Dobruja, and westward and southward as far as Avaria (Stritter, ii, 508, 509). It is curious that Schafarik, who actually identifies these Seberenses with the Hunnic Sabiri (*op. cit.* i, 332), does not seem to have seen that they were most probably of precisely the same stock as the leaders of the Serbians who founded the Servian state. We find another colony of them north of the Danube, called Severani, who occupied a district then known as the Severinian Banat, situated in the south-western corner of Wallachia. These Severanians, Schafarik, for some unknown reason, says must be clearly distinguished from the Hunnic Seberenses mentioned by Theophanes in 678 (*op. cit.* ii, 204). I confess I know of no reason why.

Having conquered the Seberenses the Bulgarians apparently held them in a more or less subordinate position, and we find a husbandman or hind still called Sabira or Sebr by the Bulgarians. The word has passed from them apparently to the neighbouring Slaves. In the law book of the Serbians, dating as far back as the reign of Stephen Dushan, in 1349, we find a rustic or peasant styled Sebr, and the same class is still called Sebar, Sibor, Cipor, &c., in Serbia and Dalmatia (Schafarik, i, 332). To sum up, therefore, the results of our reasoning, we hold that when the civil strife took place in Pannonia in the beginning of

the seventh century, when the Avars asserted their supremacy, the other Huns were driven out. One section, as we have seen, took refuge with Dagobert; another, the White Croats, in Lusatia; a third, consisting of the Sabiri, and the associated tribes of the Obodriti, &c., followed the Elbe, and settled in Sorabia, &c., as far as the North Sea, in the way we explained in previous papers. Meanwhile, other sections of the race retired elsewhere; the Bulgarians re-asserted themselves in the steppes of Besserabia, and also planted themselves under the name of Croats in Dalmatia; while the Sabiri occupied Central and Eastern Mœsia. In all these cases save that of the Bulgarians proper the tribes who were scattered were Slaves while their leaders only were of Hunnic blood. Let us now revert once more to Kubrat.

There is a notice of a Hun under the name of Kuber which, although obscure, is very interesting. This is contained in the account of the miracles of St. Demetrius by an anonymous author contained in the 4th volume for October of the "*Acta Sanctorum*," and of which the date is uncertain. This notice, perhaps on account of its difficulty, has been passed over by Schafarik, Jiresek, and others. It reports that about the middle of the seventh century, the Slaves having made an attack on the empire and been beaten, appealed for aid to the Khakan of the Avars, offering him rich presents and also to make over to him certain districts among themselves where his people might settle. This invitation the Khakan responded to with alacrity and set out with the various barbarous nations subject to him, together with all the Slaves and Bulgarians, and marched towards Thessalonica where several miracles were performed much to the terror of the invaders, who withdrew (*op. cit.* 166–170). The Avars had wasted a great part of Thrace, &c., and repaired to Sirmium on the Danube with their booty and prisoners. There we are told the Avars, Bulgars, and other races mixed together and interbred with their captives and increased very largely in numbers, adopting Roman manners. We are further told the Avar Khakan set over the new nation thus created a chief named Kuber, who apparently had his capital at Sirmium. Presently, says the chronicler, like the Israelites in Egypt, the subjects of the latter began to be rebellious against the Avar Khakan. Thereupon the latter attacked them, but having been beaten in several fights he withdrew northwards, whereupon Kuber with his people crossed the Danube, within the Roman borders, and settled down in the plain of Karamesios, and many of his people who were Christians, and who as above reported had been carried off as captives, left Kuber and returned once more to their homes in various parts of

Thrace (*id.* 179, 180). This was naturally very distasteful to Kuber and his followers, who thus saw their power gradually becoming dissipated. The migration continued, however, and Kuber and his chiefs thereupon determined upon a plot. They chose the one among them who was shrewdest and could speak Greek and Latin, *Slave and Bulgarian*, who was instructed to go to Thessalonica and make his submission; then to get a party round him, create a strife in the city and capture it, so that Kuber and his people might settle there and thence harry the neighbouring nations, the islands, and the mainland of Greece. The worthy thus chosen was named Maurus, who was of Roman origin. The Emperor received his submission graciously, and presented him with the Consular insignia. He also obtained that the fugitives who had withdrawn their allegiance from Kuber, and who he professed belonged to him, were made over to him, and he was made their chief. Many who knew his antecedents did not hide their discontent, whereupon he decapitated those whom he suspected, and sold their wives and children into slavery. He duly appointed centurions and other commanders, and soon had secured a body of people ready to do his bidding who commenced making broils inside the city, and also caused several fires. The opportune arrival of a considerable force, and the treachery of the son of Maurus, who disclosed the plot which his father and Kuber had made to the Emperor, prevented the hatching of any further mischief. Maurus was deprived of his command, but given a minor office near the city (*id.* 184). Of Kuber we read nothing more in this curious work, and it would seem that he withdrew northwards. Such is the notice which evidently as the editors of the "*Acta Sanctorum*" argue most forcibly, doubtless refers to Kubrat and his dealings with the Empire, and it points to his having been well known south of the Danube. We will now pass on again.

The history of the beginning of the Bulgarian royal house is contained in two documents: one a native saga which was apparently originally written in Greek letters, and afterwards translated into Slavic, and which occurs in an early Slave MS. This document professes to give a list of Bulgarian chiefs from the earliest time to the year 765. It is written for the most part in Slavic, but has a number of barbarous words intercalated which have been with good reason appropriated to the Ugrian or proper Bulgarians. The list begins with two princes who are both assigned patriarchal ages, and are both said to have belonged to the family of Dulo. The name I would suggest is a corruption of Attila, and the Duloids answer to the Attilides mentioned by Jornandes. The first named of the house is Avitokhol, said to have reigned 300 years. He is assuredly no other than

Attila himself. Then follows a usurper Irnik, who is said to have reigned for 150 years, who is in my view the Irnik or Hernakh, son of Attila, who is expressly said to have settled in the Lesser Scythia, *i.e.*, the Dobruja. (Jornandes de Reb. Get. 5.) After Irnik there follows a usurper named Gostun, whose name is Slavic, who belonged to family Yermi, and whose reign lasted two years.

This surely points to a break in the continuity of Hunnic history which we knew took place on the disappearance of Hernakh and his brothers. Gostun was followed by two Duloids, Kurt, who reigned 60 years—and who has been identified, I think improbably, with the Kubrat of the Byzantine authors by Jiresek—and Besmer, who reigned three, under whom we are told the Bulgars settled on the Danube. Then followed Ispcrikh (Jiresek, 127, note). This story is valuable not merely for preserving an independent list of names, but also as making it probable that in the native legends the royal house of Bulgaria belonged to the family of Attila.

The other tradition which in my view is of hardly any value is preserved by the chorographer Theophanes. He tells us that Khrobat, the king of the Bulgarians, left five sons, and bade them cling together against their enemies and not move far from their country. On his death they divided the kingdom among them, the eldest Batbaïas or Batbaïan (Nicephorus calls him Basian), careful of his father's mandate, "occupies his paternal hearth even to this day." The second, Kotragus, having crossed the Tanais or Don, settled opposite the country of his brother. The fourth and fifth having recrossed the Danube, the former went to Avarian Pannonia and became subject to the Khakan of the Avars. The other one, however, went to Ravenna, and became subject to the Christians. The third brother, called Asparukh, having crossed the Dnieper and the Dniester, settled on a river called Onklos. (Stritter, ii, 504, 505.) Jiresek has remarked that this passage upon which nearly all the subsequent accounts of the foundation of the Bulgarian polity have been based is vitiated by a patent anachronism, since it makes the Bulgars first reach the Danube in the seventh century, whereas we know (as we shall amply show in the next paper) that they had been there long before; but this, in my view, is a very small objection to what is in fact a mere congeries of incongruous traditions.

The eldest son Batbaïan, we are told, ruled his father's old country "to this day." That is Theophanes, who wrote late in the eighth century, makes himself a contemporary of a son of Kubrat who was certainly an active leader in 630. Great Bulgarians no doubt existed on the Volga in the time of Theophanes,

and he had no doubt heard of it, but its king who was living in his time could not have been the son of Kubrat. Again, the reference to Kotrag, who lived near his brother, is doubtless founded on a confusion with Kotrag, the founder of the horde of the Kotraguri who did live west of the Don, but had lived there long before this date. Again, the fourth and fifth sons are said to have recrossed the Danube, one into Pannonia, where he settled, while the other went to Italy. The recrossing of the Danube into Pannonia could only be effected from south to north, and involves the position that the Bulgars were already south of the Danube. This clause can only refer to the section of the Khrobati or Croats who did cross the Danube and settle in Pannonia, and were the only Bulgarians known to me who did so, but this was soon after Kubrat's own outbreak, and long before his death. The section which went to Italy under a fourth son is assuredly no other than the band of the Bulgarians which migrated thither under Alzek, but he again could hardly have been a son of Kubrat. At every stage, therefore, the story of Theophanes breaks to pieces. The knowledge he had of these northern parts may be gauged from the fact that he makes the Tanais or Don, which he brings from the Caucasus, a tributary of the Atal or Volga, and makes these two rivers give birth to the Kuphis or Kuban, in which the Xystus, a Bulgarian fish, was caught, and where he says Old (*i.e.*, Great) Bulgaria and the region of the Kotrragi who were tributaries of the Bulgarians were.

When Kurt died we know not, and from the genealogical table above quoted he was doubtless succeeded by Besmer who was in turn succeeded by Isperikh or Asparukh, a name of apparently Persian origin. He is mentioned both in the native list and by Theophanes, who assigns to him the crossing of the Danube, when the Bulgars finally settled in Moesia. This migration was, I believe, induced by the invasion of the Khazars, as suggested by Theophanes himself. This invasion apparently first took place during the reign of Constantine the Second (642-668), and during the next few years the Khazars apparently subdued the various Hunnic tribes of Southern Russia, and I believe their campaigns caused the migration of Isperikh and his people to the south of the Danube.

It was under Asparukh or Isperikh, as the famous gloss calls him, that the Bulgarians first settled south of the Danube. His people had previously lived in the district north of that river called Oglos by Nicephorus, which, as Schafarik pointed out, answers to the old Slave Agl or Ongl, Polish Wegiel or Wengiel, Latin Angulus, and doubtless referred to the corner enclosed by the Black Sea, the Danube, and the Pruth known as

Budzak, *i.e.*, corner (Schafarik, ii, 163, note 2; Jiresek *Gesch. von Bulgaren*, 129). Theophanes calls it Onclus, and says it was a river. Thence they made raids across the Danube, and about the year 678 the Emperor Constantine Pogonatos collected a large force from the different parts of Thrace and prepared a naval and military expedition to punish them. He sent his ships to the mouths of the Danube, while his soldiers made their way to Oglos. The Bulgarians, afraid of his preparations, retired to their fortresses, where the Imperial troops dared not assail them on account of the neighbouring marshes. The Emperor was meanwhile attacked with gout and left with his family on five fast ships to go to the baths of Mesembria, ordering his generals to try and bring on an engagement or to keep the enemy blockaded till his return. The soldiers fancied that he had fled, nor could the officers, who presented the points of their swords, restrain them, and after a short delay they began to retire. They were attacked in their retreat by the Bulgarians and apparently lost many men. The Bulgarians then crossed the river and advanced as far as Varna and subdued the country between the Black Sea and the river (that is the district of the Dobruja) and subdued the seven tribes of Slavini who lived there. They also made tributary the Seberenses, who lived between the marshes of the Dobruja and the Balkan pass of Beregaba and westward, and the seven tribes who lived towards the south and west as far as Avaria, *i.e.*, the country which had been subdued by the Avars (Stritter, ii, 508, 509), that is probably westward as far as the Serbian Morava and Belgrade (Schafarik, ii, 164, 165), and of which we have made mention in the former paper on the Serbians. The Dobruja and the watershed of Kamsiya, or Kamchek, as Jiresek says, were till the tenth century the focus and kernel of the Bulgarian kingdom. Preslaf, on the Great Kamsiya, was the capital, and Drster (the modern Silistria) the fortress of the kingdom. It is strange that it is in this very district that to this day the Turks and Tartars have their principal seats. All the expeditions of the Byzantine troops against the Bulgarians in the eighth and ninth centuries were not westwards by way of Philippopolis towards Sophia or Tirnova, but in the direction of the mouths of the Danube and the district of Varna (*op. cit.* 131). It is a curious fate, therefore, which has overtaken the Dobruja that it should have been detached from Bulgaria and joined to Roumania in the new arrangement of the European map. We must remember, however, that this area was one in which many race revolutions took place afterwards, and that Tartars and Turks now form its main population. But to revert to the Bulgarians proper. They were clearly only a conquering

caste of foreigners supplying the upper ranks of the social structure and giving their name to the country while the great bulk of the population remained what it had been before, Slavic. It was a case, as has been pointed out, similar to the settlement of the Franks in Gaul, of the Norsemen in Normandy, the Lombards in Lombardy, and the Romans, or Romaioi, in the old land of the Hellenes. In all cases it was a conquering and superior caste coming in and changing the name and invigorating the blood of a race previously occupying the land. Sigebert who copied the so-called "*Historia Miscella*," which was probably composed by Paulus Diaconus, dates the defeat of Constantine in the year 680 and calls the Bulgarian king Bathaia (Pertz, vi, 326). Thenceforward Moesia was lost to the Byzantine empire, and its fair towns and fields became the prey of the Nomades from the east. The Emperor Constantine Pogonatos agreed to pay them tribute or black mail under the guise of an annual pension, in order to protect his frontiers from attack, and Thrace south of the Balkans was reorganized as a *thema* and was placed under the jurisdiction of a *prætor* (Stritter, ii, 509). Well might the chronicler bewail that the former mistress of the east and west should be constrained to pay tribute to this unclean race.

Constantine's son Justinian the Second, Rhinotmetos, proposed to break off this hateful yoke and to subdue the Bulgarians and Slavini. He ordered the mounted legions to pass over into Thrace, which had been invaded by the Bulgarians, whom he defeated. He also invaded the country occupied by the Slaves, who were probably more or less subject to the Bulgars, and went as far as Thessalonica. He planted some of them as tributaries in the mountains west of the Strymon, and transported a great number of others into Asia, where they were settled in the districts of Opsicium and Abydos. On his return from this campaign he was waylaid in the defiles of Mount Rhodope, and lost many of his men, and only reached home again with difficulty (*id.* 510). This campaign, according to the Byzantine writers, took place in 686-7. Sigebert dates it in 689 (Pertz, vi, 327).

According to the royal catalogue already mentioned, Ispirikh reigned for 60 years, *i.e.* from about 640-700 (Jiresek, 140), and was succeeded by Tervel, who is called Terbeles by the Greeks and Therbellis by Sigebert, and who also belonged to the family of Dulo. In 702 Justinian, who had been driven away from Constantinople, and exiled to the Crimea, had made his way to the court of the ruler of the Khazars, and had married his sister Theodora (Sigebert says he fled to Caian, ruler of the Avars), but having been warned that his brother-in-law intended to hand him over to his enemies at Byzantium, he set sail in a small ship and reached the mouth of the Danube. He then despatched

a messenger to Tervel, asking him to assist him in reconquering his throne, and promising to reward him in a lordly fashion, and also to give him his daughter's hand in marriage. Tervel agreed to help him, and he set out for Constantinople with a large force of Bulgarians and Slaves, which numbered about 15,000. He duly approached the city, to which he gained access by the assistance of his friends, and again occupied the throne. He rewarded his ally the Bulgarian king with rich presents, and also ceded to him the district of Zagoria (*i.e.*, in Slave, the mountain country) the ancient Debelto, situated between Shumla and the Black Sea towards Burghaz.

Schafarik says the district was not completely united to Bulgaria till the year 861; Nicephorus and Kedrenus both pointedly refer to it as *now* called Zagoria (Lebeau, xii, 60-64; Stritter, ii, 511-514; Schafarik, ii, 171). Justinian was not a very faithful ally, and in 705 he went with a fleet and army to Anchialus. The Bulgarians meanwhile retired to their fastnesses; thereupon the Romans, having scattered themselves over the surrounding country for the purpose of foraging, were suddenly attacked and lost a great number of prisoners, horses, and waggons. The Emperor and the rest of them regained the fortress, whence, after making an ignominious display of bravado on the walls, he suddenly took his departure in the night and returned to his capital (Stritter, 514, 515). In 708, when Justinian was being pressed by his rival Philippicus, he again appealed to the Bulgarian king, who sent him 3,000 soldiers. This dissolute prince was deposed in 711 without a blow, whereupon Philippicus allowed the Bulgarians to return home again (*id.* 515, 516). Suidas reports that Tervel, in measuring out the tribute due to him, used to place his shield on the ground, and drew the money into it with his whip; he also planted his spear in the ground, and insisted upon pieces of silk being piled up around it to a considerable height, and exacted as a reward for his soldiers that their right hands should be filled with gold, and their left ones with silver (*id.* 516; Lebeau, xii, 64).

In the year 712, during the reign of Philippicus, the Bulgarians advanced to the Gulf of Céras. So quick was their march, that it was only known at Constantinople when the suburb of Syques was seen to be in flames. A rich citizen was being married there, and a mass of plate and other objects prepared for a sumptuous feast was captured by the invaders. They made a horrible slaughter of the guests, and advanced as far as the Golden Gate of Byzantium, overran Thrace, and returned with a crowd of prisoners and of domestic animals, and reached their homes in safety (Stritter, *op. cit.*, 516, 517; Lebeau, xii, 86).

Theodosius the Third was a feeble creature. He had been suddenly raised to the purple from the position of a small tax-gatherer, and had an ephemeral reign of a few months. In 716 A.D. Theophanes tells us he made an unfortunate peace with the Bulgarians, to whom he abandoned a part of Thrace; the Imperial frontier was fixed at a place called Meleona, identified by Schafarik with Menalion in the Balkans, and an annual tribute of rich stuffs, and of skins dyed red (i.e., no doubt of the famous Bulgarian leather)—the precursors of our Russia leather—to the value of 30 pounds of gold, was to be paid. It was agreed that fugitives who had taken refuge in either country should be given up, and that merchants with proper credentials should have free right of trafficking (Stritter, 517, 518). Theophanes who tells us these facts, calls the Bulgarian king Komersios, but this is apparently an anachronism. He did not probably reign till later.

Theodosius was succeeded by Leo the Isaurian, who won a speedy fame by repelling the attack which the Saracens in 717, made upon Constantinople. After a vigorous siege prosecuted with their usual ardour and with immense resources the Saracens were foiled and had to withdraw. As they marched towards his ships, which were at anchor below Constantinople, they were attacked by the Bulgarians, who more out of fear that they might have these martial freebooters for neighbours, than out of any love for the Romans, attacked them and caused them a loss of 22,000 men (Stritter, *op. cit.* 518; Lebeau, xii, 123). This is dated by Sigebert in 718. He says the Saracens lost 30,000 men (Pertz, vi, 329). Meanwhile Anastasius, who had been on the throne, and been compelled to retire and become a priest, began to aspire once more to reign, and *inter alia* opened communications with Sisinius, the Imperial envoy at the Court of Tervel, to secure the assistance of the latter. Tervel, we are told, furnished his friend with 5,000 pounds of gold to defray the cost of his enterprise, while the latter opened secret negotiations with several officials at the Court. The Bulgarians had arrived at Heraclea, the ancient Perinthus, where they collected a number of boats, on which to move upon Constantinople. Leo having heard of all this, threatened the Bulgarians with his vengeance, and at the same time offered them a large sum of money, whereupon they treacherously surrendered Anastasius and the Archbishop of Thessalonica, who were duly decapitated (Stritter, *op. cit.*, 519, 520; Lebeau, xii, 127).

We do not again read of the Bulgarians in the Byzantine annals till the year 755; but in the indigenous list of kings previously quoted, we read that Tervel reigned 21 years, i.e., till

720. He was followed by another chief of the family of Dulo, whose name has unfortunately been erased, and he by another Duloid, named Sevar, who reigned five years, that is, till 753. This authority makes him be succeeded by Kormisos, who belonged to another stock, namely, that of Ukil or Vokil, and who was probably a usurper (Jiresek, 127 and 140). He is mentioned by the Byzantine writers who call him Kormesios. Theophanes, who apparently antedates him, calls him Komersios (Stritter, ii, 517, note 24). I may say that Sigebert, under the year 727, has the phrase "*Cormisus Bulgaribus dominatur*" (Pertz, vi, 330).

In 755 the famous Iconoclast Emperor, Constantine the Fifth, Copronymos, whose energy against the enemies of the empire was as remarkable as his fanatical hatred of monks and images, founded some new towns in Thrace, and peopled them with Syrian and Armenian colonists. While these towns were being built, the Bulgarians appeared and demanded tribute, which being refused them, they proceeded to devastate Thrace, and advanced as far as the famous long walls. The Emperor offered them battle, defeated them, and pursuing their army killed many of them. He then prepared a large naval and land force with which to punish them. With a fleet of 500 ships he approached the Danube, and then harried the land of the Bulgarians and made many captives. He gained a fresh victory over them near the fort of the Markellians, situated on the Bulgarian frontier, and they were constrained to sue for peace, and to offer their children as hostages (Stritter, ii, 520, 521; Lebeau, xii, 231, 232).

In 759 the Emperor again advanced against the Bulgarians who had molested the empire in alliance with the Macedonian Slavini and approached Beregaba, one of the Eastern passes of the Balkans, probably either Nadir Derbend or the mule track from Mesembria to Varna by way of Eminch (Jiresek, 141), but the Bulgarians waylaid his people in the passes, many of them, including some prominent officials, were killed, and their army made a somewhat ignominious retreat (*id.* 521).

According to the catalogue of Bulgarian kings above cited, Kormisos reigned 17 years. This Jiresek would correct, with some probability, to seven, and make him reign from 753-760 (*op. cit.* 140). Kormisos, as we have seen, was an usurper, and did not belong to the old royal stock of Dulo, and we now read that a great internal convulsion took place among the Bulgarians. They extirpated the old royal house (*i.e.*, that of Dulo), and elected a prince named Teletzis or Teleutzas, an arrogant and conceited young man, who was 30 years old, to the throne (Stritter, ii, 522). He is mentioned in the catalogue of Princes, and is there called Telec, and is stated to have been of the family of Ugain (Jiresek, 127 and 142).

In consequence of this revolution a great crowd of Slavini, to the number of 208,000, left their country, and were allowed by the Emperor to settle on the river Artanas in Bythinia (Stritter, ii, 522; Schafarik, ii, 172). Telec having collected a large force invaded the borders of the Empire, whereupon the Emperor Constantine despatched an armament of 800 boats, each carrying 12 horses, to the Lower Danube. He himself marched to Anchialus, where Telec went to meet him at the head of his Bulgarians, and with 20,000 Slavinian auxiliaries. The latter was defeated in a battle fought on the 30th of June, and lasting from eight in the morning till sunset, and many, both Bulgarians and Slavini, were killed, and several of their chiefs were made prisoners. The captives were taken to Byzantium and executed outside the walls in batches by the several factions of the Circus, and in the triumph which followed we are told that *inter alia* two gold basins which the Bulgarian kings had had made in Sicily, and each weighing 800 pounds, were exhibited among the spoils (Stritter, 523, 524; Lebeau, xii, 244).

We now come upon a period of revolution and discord in Bulgaria. The Bulgarians, in consequence of their disastrous defeat, rose in revolt against Telec, whom they killed with several of his chief men. They then raised Sabinus, whom Theophanes calls a relative of Kormisos, and Schafarik and Jiresek, I know not on what authority, his son-in-law (Stritter, ii, 524; Schafarik, ii, 172; Jiresek, 142) to the throne. But he having immediately sent envoys to arrange a peace, was charged with a desire to put the kingdom under subjection to the Emperor, and a tumultuous assembly having met, where he was much assailed, he deemed it prudent to fly, and went to Mesembria, and thence to the Emperor with his intimate friends. Their wives and children hid away for fear of the insurgents, and were at length rescued by some officers sent by Constantine (Stritter, 524). Sabinus was apparently not a native Bulgarian, since he bore a Roman name, and his authority was doubtless very transient. He is not mentioned in the indigenous list of kings.

The Bulgarians now put a new chief named Paganus or Pagarus, as he is called in a gloss to Anastasius (both probably a corruption of Bayan, Jiresek, 142) in his place. This took place in 762.

Two years later Paganus sent envoys to demand peace from the Emperor, and then went in person with his *boilades* and chieftains to the latter's presence. He found him seated on his throne with Sabinus seated beside him. The Emperor apparently detained Paganus and his grandees, upbraided them for their conduct to Sabinus, and then made a hollow peace with them. He furtively sent some of his people into Bulgaria, who seized

upon a chief of the Slavini, who according to one reading of Theophanes, was named Seberus, while another makes him a leader of the Seberian Slavini who had committed much ravage in Thrace. They also seized an apostate Christian, a leader of the mountain brigands, called Skamari, and having cut off his hands and feet, made him over to the doctors, who opened his body while he was still living and made a public demonstration of anatomy on the mole of St. Thomas, after which he was thrown into the fire (Stritter, 526; Lebeau, xii, 250, 251). Shortly after this the Emperor again invaded Bulgaria, the outposts to which were bare of defenders, because of the recently made peace, and went as far as Tuntzas, or Tzikas, *i.e.*, the river Tytscha, laid the country waste, and then returned in a panic without effecting anything (*id.* 526; Schafarik, ii, 172).

The next year Constantine again invaded Bulgaria, where the people had driven out Umar or Omar, the nominee of Sabinus, and had put Toktu, the brother of Bayan, in his place. This Omar is the last of the Bulgarian rulers named in the native list so often mentioned. His name is clearly not Ugrian, and points to the influence of Mohammedanism having already been potent among the Bulgarians. Omar, according to the list, was of the family of Ukil. It makes him immediately succeed Telec.

On the approach of the Emperor, as I have mentioned, the Bulgarians fled to the woods about the Lower Danube. Nevertheless a large number of them were killed, including Toktu and his brother Bayan, who, if the same person as Paganus, had apparently returned again to his own country.

Another of their leaders, whom they called Campaganus (he is identified with Paganus by St. Martin (Lebeau, xii, 252, note 2), fled towards Varna, and had virtually escaped when he was put to death by his slaves. The Bulgarians seem, in fact, to have been badly crushed, and the Romans wasted the greater part of their territory (Stritter, 526, 527). In 766 Constantine advanced again to the borders of the Bulgarians, and determined to assail their stronghold, called Embolos (*i.e.*, the outlet) of the Berigianians. For this purpose he prepared a vast flotilla of 2,600 ships, and ordered them to rendezvous at Mesembria and Ankhialus. This fleet and the immense army which was its complement greatly terrified the Bulgarians, and they were prepared to treat for terms, when a terrible storm intervened, destroyed the fleet, and a vast number of his people; whereupon the Emperor returned to Constantinople (*id.* 527, 528). This was a great blow to the empire, and we read how in 768 the Slaves of Macedonia and Thessaly made a piratical raid on the islands of the *Ægean*, and it cost 2,500 robes to ransom

the inhabitants of Imbros, Samothrace, and Tenedos, whom they carried off (Jiresek, 142).

In 774 the Emperor Constantine the Fifth ventured upon another campaign against the Bulgarians. He sent his cavalry to occupy the passes and went to Varna with 2,000 transports. Theophanes tells us he proposed to go himself to the mouth of the Danube against the Russian boats, which he calls "*Khelandia*." These Russians were no doubt Scandinavians and were apparently allied with the Bulgarians. It is the first time they are mentioned in history. The Emperor when he reached Varna became frightened, and was for returning. On the other hand, the Bulgarians, frightened at his arrival, sent Boilas and Tzigatus (Anastasius says, Boilan Tzigates (?), *i.e.*, the Boila Tzigates) to treat for peace. A treaty was accordingly made, and its conditions written down, and each ruler promised to respect the other's border. Thereupon the Emperor, who was by no means anxious for fighting, returned home again (Stritter, 528, 529). A few months later, however, we read that the Bulgarians sent an army of 12,000 men, under their boilades, who made an attack upon Berzetia (Jiresek glosses this as Brsjaken land (?)) which was apparently an independent country, and to capture prisoners. The Emperor thereupon collected a large force, and in order not to seem as if he was breaking the peace, he professed it was directed against the Avars, who were then very troublesome.

He fell upon Bulgaria by way of Lithosoria (?) with 80,000 men, and won a potent victory, and returned with a large booty. This treacherous campaign was nevertheless dignified with the name of a noble war, since no Roman soldiers or towns suffered. It was clearly a victory won through the Byzantine virtue of craft over the too trusting Bulgarians, and the fact is so acknowledged by Theophanes and the more candid chroniclers. Knowing that his conduct had involved savage reprisals, the Emperor in 774-5 prepared a fresh fleet, which was again broken to pieces by the weather, near Mesembria. The Bulgarians now paid back the treacherous Emperor in his own coin. Teleric their ruler (he is so called by Zonaras, Theophanes calls him Tzerig, and Kedrenus Eleric) wrote the Emperor a letter, in which he professed that he wished to desert his own country, and go and live with him. In the meanwhile, for his own safety, he wished the Emperor to inform him of those among the Bulgarians who were his (Constantine's) friends and partizans, in order that he might confer with them. The Emperor ingenuously sent such list, and these friends of the empire were speedily put to death, much to the chagrin of Constantine (Stritter, 530, 351; Lebeau, xii, 302,

note 3). It was probably to avenge this wrong that, in 775, he set out on another Bulgarian campaign, but he died on the way (*id.* 531).

Constantine was succeeded by Leo the Khazar, in the first year of whose reign Teleric fled to Constantinople, where he was well received, married the cousin of Leo's wife Irene, and was given the title of a patrician. He was baptized, the Emperor himself acting as his sponsor, and was rewarded with rich presents (*id.* 531-2). In 789 the Bulgarians again assailed the empire. Philetus, Duke of Thrace, was surprised by them and perished with the greater part of his army (Lebeau, xii, 352).

In the spring of 791 the young Emperor Constantine the Sixth fought against the Bulgarians, who were led by their king Kardam, at Provat on the river St. George in Thrace, the moderna Pravadi in the Balkans, between Shumla and Varna (*id.* 532, 533; Schafarik, ii, 173; Lebeau, xii, 357, note). After a slight skirmish both sides seem to have been panic stricken, and returned homewards. The following year he again went to Bulgaria, and built the town called the fortress of Markellians in the Balkans. Meanwhile Kardam with his people occupied the passes; and the Emperor was led away by his youthful ardour and the advice of his councillors, one of whom, Pancratius, who is described as an astronomer or astrologer, foretold that he would win a victory. He was, on the contrary, terribly defeated, and lost a great number of men, including several great dignitaries of state, among whom were Lakhanodracon, the best general and most wicked man in the Empire, and Pancratius himself, while the baggage and sumpter cattle, and the Imperial equipage fell a prey to the victors (*id.* 533; Lebeau, xii, 359).

It would seem the Byzantine Empire, in addition to its other humiliations, had to pay tribute to the Bulgarians.

For fourteen years the annals are silent about Bulgaria, when we are told there came a minatory message from the aged Kardam threatening that, unless the Emperor would agree to pay him tribute, he would advance to the Golden Gate of Constantinople, and would overrun Thrace. The Emperor thereupon sent him some dung folded in a cloth, and said, "The tribute you demand I send you. As you are an old man I do not wish to fatigue you, I will come and meet you at the fortress of the Markellians; perhaps you will meet me there, and God shall judge between us." He thereupon collected a large force, and proceeded to attack Kardam and his Bulgarians in the forest of Abroleba, for seventeen days; after which the Bulgarians grew weary of the struggle and returned home again (Stritter, ii, 534; Lebeau, xii, 369). We do not read of the Bulgarians again till 807,

when Nicephorus proposed to march against them, but was detained at home in consequence of a conspiracy.

In the year 809 the Bulgarians waylaid the Imperial military chest near the river Strymon, and captured over 100,000 pounds of gold, and a large number of the soldiers with their commander were killed. A general muster then took place of the "taxati proceres" from the neighbouring districts, whereupon the Bulgarians withdrew (Stritter, ii, 535). The same year before Easter, Krum, the Bulgarian ruler, invaded the Roman borders, captured Sardica (*i.e.*, the modern Sophia) and killed 6,000 soldiers, besides many of the citizens. The Emperor Nicephorus would thereupon have marched against them, but his councillors were afraid, and began to disperse. On his speaking harshly to them, some deserted, including a famous Arab mechanician, named Enthymius, and he had to return without doing anything. Two years later Nicephorus again set out with his son Stauracius, and with a large army from Thrace and other parts, among whom were a large number of poor people armed with slings and poles, who were attracted by the hopes of pay. When this army reached the fort of the Markellians Krum grew frightened and sued for peace, but the Emperor, who is described as a second Ahab by the chronicler Theophanes, insisted upon trying his fortune in the dangerous country of Bulgaria. Before he entered it, however, he was deserted by one of his favourite slaves who fled to the enemy, taking with him 100 pounds of gold and the Imperial robes, a desertion which was deemed of sinister omen; we are told the Emperor constantly repeated to himself "I know not whether I am compelled by God or the Devil, but an irresistible force seems to urge me on." At first the Imperialists were successful, and behaved with great cruelty; the Emperor ordered even the children to be slaughtered, and busied himself only with looking after the plunder. Krum's palace, which Zonaras says was called his *aula* by the Bulgarians, was burnt, and the Emperor put his seal upon his effects and punished several soldiers who committed rapine there by cutting off their hands and ears. Krum begged him to spare his people, and offered to accept any terms he should dictate; but this being refused, he assembled and harangued his men, and blocked up the exit and ingress to the place where the Imperialists were encamped with wooden fences like a wall. The Bulgarians worked so hard that in two days the Imperialists were caged in an iron grasp. When Nicephorus learnt what had been done he despaired of escape. After some days the Bulgarians made a night attack upon the camp and caused a terrible slaughter. Nicephorus himself and his chief men were killed and beheaded. Among the latter were Aetius, Peter,

Sisinius, Tryphyles, and Theodosius, all patricians. Salibaras, called the Prefect, also a patrician; Romanus the patrician, and Duke of the East, the Duke of Thrace, and many protospatharii, spatharii, commanders of the army, men of the bedchamber, provincial officers and a vast crowd of people, so that the noblest and greatest among the Christians perished on that day, besides a vast number of arms and treasure. The chronicler naturally adopts very lugubrious phrases in describing the disaster. He adds that Krum carried off the Imperial head as a trophy, hung it on a tree, and showed it in triumph to his various peoples, and then in the fashion so prevalent among the Turcoman races, when the flesh had decayed off it, he covered the skull with silver, and converted it into a drinking cup, to be used when he joined in the feasts with the *zdravicas* or *boljars* of the Slavini. Stauracius escaped badly wounded to Adrianople, and died six months later; others also found refuge in the forests and marshes (Stritter, *op. cit.* 536-541; Lebeau, xii, 446-449), but altogether the disaster was appalling, and gave rise to one of Gibbon's sonorous phrases, in which he says that the advantage of the death of Nicephorus overbalanced, in the public opinion, the destruction of a Roman army (*op. cit.* vi, 88).

The next year Krum overran Thrace and Macedonia. He captured Debeltos, not far from the Black Sea, and carried off its citizens and bishop. The chronicler says he transported them into "another country," by which expression Schafarik understands Hungary, but which doubtless means Wallachia. Meanwhile the Emperor Michael, who had marched against him, had to try and conciliate his own rebellious soldiers with presents and otherwise, and the invaders had it their own way accordingly. Ankhialus and Berrhæa were deserted, as were Nicæa, Philippopolis, Probatir (*i.e.*, Pravati), Philippi, and Amphipolis, then called Strymon (Stritter, *op. cit.* 542, 543).

Krum, who was master of a portion of Thrace and Macedonia, now made overtures through his envoy Dragomir (Dargameros) to renew the pact formerly made between Theodosius and the Bulgarians in the year 716, with the additional conditions that the Greek merchants should in entering Bulgaria make a declaration of the goods they had with them for customs purposes, and in default have them confiscated, and that the Emperor should undertake to restore not only Bulgarian fugitives, but also such Roman prisoners as had succeeded in breaking their bonds and escaping (Stritter, *op. cit.* 543). In case his terms were refused, he threatened to attack Mesembria, the modern Misivria, on the Gulf of Burghas, which he proceeded to beleaguer. His siege artillery was superintended by an Arab skilled in such machines, who had been baptised

under the name of Euthymius, and had been stationed at Adrianople; but not getting the rewards he expected from the Greeks, and having, in fact, suffered punishment at their hands, he deserted to the Bulgarians, as I have mentioned, and taught them the secrets of his craft. They were not long in capturing the city, and secured much booty of gold and silver there, including 36 brazen tubes to shoot Greek fire through, with a quantity of that terrible ammunition (*id.* 544–548). Michael was now anxious to make peace, and sent for the chief ecclesiastical dignitaries to consult with him.

The question of surrendering the refugees was the chief difficulty. The Bulgarian laws were very severe, and many to escape them had fled to Constantinople and been baptized, and had attracted a number of others in their wake, so that the Bulgarian king began to fear that his kingdom might be depopulated. On the other hand, the Bulgarians held in captivity even a larger number of Greek prisoners. This weighed with the Emperor and others who, with Hobson's choice before them of giving up certain Bulgarians to condign punishment or of leaving a number of Greeks to suffer death, chose, we read, like people in a shipwreck, to side with those dearest to them, a conclusion which would also secure peace. Two of the principal church dignitaries raised their voice against this course. They declared it would be infamous to surrender refugees who had trusted themselves with them, and who in becoming Christians had in fact ceased to be refugees. Constantinople had become not merely their home but their sanctuary, and as to their own compatriots they ought to release them with the sword and not at the expense of their victims (Stritter, 544, 545; Lebeau, xii, 465, 466). Meanwhile Krum, having captured Mesembria, proceeded to lay waste Thrace. His course was only stayed by the outbreak of a terrible epidemic, which destroyed two-thirds of his army, and compelled him to retire. The Emperor determined to take advantage of his weakness. He collected his forces, chiefly Cappadocians and Armenians, who were, however, scandalized by the interference in military affairs of the Empress Procopia. It was decided that the army should not move beyond the Roman frontier, and soon its exactions upon the citizens was found to be even more harassing than a hostile invasion. In June Krum crossed the frontier and advanced to Bersinikia. Some small skirmishes took place in which the Greeks generally won. Meanwhile the extreme heat severely taxed the Bulgarians, and the Emperor was for trusting to the weather rather than his arms. His prudence aroused murmurs among his men, incited by Leo the Armenian, who had his own game to play, and a battle was determined upon. In this struggle the Imperialists seem at

first to have been successful, but according to the chroniclers the tide of victory was turned by the defection of Leo, who withdrew with his men at a critical moment, when a panic ensued. At first the Bulgarians, thinking the retreat a ruse, refused to follow, but presently, seeing the Greeks scattered, they fell upon them furiously, and having slaughtered a great number secured a crowd of prisoners and a great quantity of trophies.

Michael retired to Constantinople, and soon after resigned the throne to Leo who was raised to it by the soldiery (Stritter, 548-553). Krum, leaving his brother to attack Adrianople, advanced himself towards Constantinople and made a perambulation about the city from Blakhernas to the Golden Gate. In a meadow outside, we are told, he went through some demoniacal sorceries and sacrificed men and cattle (Simeon Logotheta et auct. incertus Stritter, 554). One author mentions especially dogs as being sacrificed. Krum then went down to the seashore where he dipped his feet in the water and washed them, and then sprinkled the army and made his progress to his tent between two rows of his concubines, who meanwhile sang songs in his praise. The strength of the walls and of the defending army soon showed him that it would not be feasible to take the city. He accordingly was ready to listen to terms, and was apparently willing to withdraw if secured the payment of an annual subsidy, and a present of rich garments and a number of maidens. He also demanded permission to thrust his spear into the Golden Gate of the city. Leo suggested a conference, and that Krum, attended by some of his people unarmed, should again repair to the strand while he (Leo) would, in company with some of his people, draw near in a ship, and they could arrange terms at a colloquy. Meanwhile the faithless Emperor ordered three of his men to plant themselves in ambush, and having given them the watchword ordered them on a given signal to fire their arrows on the unsuspecting Bulgarian chief. The latter duly set out to keep his appointment, accompanied by three companions, namely, Constantine called Patzes, who had some time before fled to the Bulgarians, and married Krum's sister, Constantine's son, and his Logotheta or finance minister. The Bulgarian king dismounted, whereupon the signal was duly given, the three men in ambush sprang out. Krum got on his horse, and although wounded fled and reached his people in safety. His companions, however, were captured, and the Logotheta was put to death (*id.* 554-556).

Naturally enraged at this act of wanton treachery, Krum proceeded to wreak his vengeance with no light hand. He wasted the district with fire and sword, burnt the beautiful

churches outside the city gate, which had been built by Irene, Nicephorus, and Michael, with the monasteries and palaces. Then passing on to the suburb of Saint Thomas, he destroyed the palaces and sacred structures there, burning the buildings and breaking the columns, and destroyed the circus with its marble statues, its brazen lion, &c., killing all whom he met, even the cattle. Thence his people made their way to the strand and set fire to all the fleet, and captured a vast booty, and burnt a large portion of the town inside the Golden Gate as far as the Riggins, which falls into the Propontis west of Selymbria. They overthrew the famous bridge at the river Athyras, now called the Karasu, and wasted the town, ravaged Selymbria (now called Selivria), Daonis, and the environs of Heraclea. They laid waste Rhædestas, now Rodosto, on the Sea of Marmora, plundered the outskirts of Panios, and then entered the Ganian mountains. From this district they carried off a great number of prisoners, and collected a vast troop of cattle, women, and boys, whom they sent off into Bulgaria. They then advanced into the Chersonese to Hexamilios, Abydos, and Ebros, and overthrew all the towns great and small from there to Adrianople (*id.* 556, 557). They then beleaguered Adrianople itself, whose citizens, pressed by famine, consented to surrender the town. The ravage must have been terrible. Krum was at length avenged, and withdrew with a great body of captives, who were transported to "Bulgaria beyond the Danube," a phrase which has been interpreted by Schafarik as meaning Hungary as far as Pesth, Erlau, Marmarosh, &c., and the Theiss (*op. cit.* ii, 174 and 201, 202), but I believe the phrase means merely Wallachia, which was a part of the Bulgarian kingdom, and I am strongly inclined to believe that the Vlakhs of this district and of Transylvania are largely, though not altogether, the descendants of the Macedonians transported by Krum and his successor.

Among those transported were all the citizens of Adrianople, including Manuel the bishop, also the parents of Basil, who was afterwards Emperor, and Basil himself then a boy. These emigrants, we are told, were closely attached to the Christian faith and converted many of the Bulgarians, among whom there were at this time no Christians (*id.* 557, 558, note). Elated by his former victory Krum, it would seem, repeated his attack the next year and proceeded as before to harry the inhabitants and cattle; thereupon the Emperor Leo once more sent hostages to treat for peace. This being scornfully rejected, he marched with his troops towards Mesembria and intrenched himself near there. The Bulgarians were not long in coming, but meanwhile he secreted his people on a mountain, afterwards called Leo's Hill, whence after nightfall he fell on the unsuspecting invaders,

who were panic stricken, many of them were killed, while Krum himself escaped with difficulty. The Emperor then to have made a raid into Bulgaria, where he made many seems captives. The men were slaughtered, the women carried off as slaves, while the children in arms were barbarously broken against the stones, and Leo returned home in triumph (*id.* 558-560).

This was a fortunate issue for the Greeks, who were no doubt in a very serious difficulty, and we are not surprised to find that this very year, *i.e.*, in 814, envoys went to Louis, the Emperor of the Franks, to solicit his aid against the Bulgarians and other barbarians (*Ann. Lauriss, Pertz, i, 122*). Apparently during the succeeding winter, which was a very mild one, Krum at the head of 30,000 men, who are said to have been encased in iron, advanced as far as Arcadiopolis, which they captured, and then made a regular "baranta" after the fashion of the Turkomans, driving off 50,000 people captive, who were doubtless transported across the Danube, and sent to join their relatives in Wallachia and Transylvania. These captives were transported with all their property, including their cattle-yokes, their domestic furniture, clothes, tools, and herds of oxen and sheep. It was, in fact, the transportation of a whole people for the purpose of colonization. The Roumans of our day are in every probability the descendants of the Thracian peasants carried off by the Bulgarians, a transportation which began in the sixth century, but was largely the work of Krum.

Krum made still another campaign against the empire. We are told that he collected a vast army of Avars, and of different kinds of Slavini, with an elaborate siege apparatus, 5,000 carts and 10,000 sumpter beasts, and marched towards the Imperial city. Leo having heard of these preparations, ordered a levy and enlarged the defences of his capital, causing a new ditch and rampart to be made on the side of Blakhernas. The impending struggle, however, was averted by the death of Krum, which occurred on the 13th of April, and was accompanied by bleeding at the mouth, ears, and nose. It was reported that some mariners coasting along the Bulgarian shore heard a voice from heaven announcing his death, which was no doubt most grateful news to the Greeks. Schafarik and Jiresek date the event in the year 811—I know not on what authority, and in fact this date is hardly compatible with the events that are reported as having occurred between the time of his great defeat and his death, and it would seem that he did not die at least before the year 816.

Krum was a most important figure in Bulgarian history, and his prowess was felt not only in the south but also in the north

of his kingdom. The victories of Charlemagne had broken the power of the Avars and made it easy for Krum to extend his attacks in the direction of Pannonia, and he overthrew the power of the Avars to its very foundation. The Bulgarians, we are told, were much pleased with the dress of the Avars, which they adopted in lieu of their own. Krum questioned his Avar prisoners as to why their sovereign and they had been so grievously overthrown. They replied that false witness and mutual slanders had been the cause of their misfortunes as they had of other powerful States. The wise and prudent had been displaced from the government by the intrigues of the powerful; injustice and venality had affected the administration of justice, drunkenness had prevailed greatly among them, while others had been corrupted by bribes, and that all of them had become merchants and had taken to cheating one another. Thence, they said, their overthrow. Accordingly Krum called together the Bulgars, and created new laws for them, punishing with death those who should accuse others falsely. He forbade the use of intoxicating drinks, and ordered the vines to be torn up by the roots. Avarice was condemned, and hospitality and generosity inculcated, &c. (*id.* 562, 563). The extent to which the Bulgarians dominated at this time in Pannonia has been much exaggerated. It would seem from the few facts we possess that the power of the Avars had now been thoroughly crushed, and that their old country was now divided between the Franks and the Bulgarians, who were conterminous with one another. Schafarik, Dummmler, and others, make the Theiss the western boundary of the Bulgarian kingdom, and include in it all the country to the east of that river; but from the negotiations that took place shortly after this with the Franks about a definite boundary it is not probable that the limit was of such a definite nature as the river Theiss. It seems, on the contrary, to me, that there intervened between the Bulgarian and Frankish borders a piece of more or less independent territory still subject to Avar princes, who were dependent on the Franks.

Eginhardt tells us that in 818, while the Frank Emperor was staying at Heristal, envoys went to him from the Obodriti as well as from Bornas, the ruler of the Goduscani and Timociani, who had lately separated from the Bulgarians and placed themselves under the authority of the Franks (Eginhardt *Annales*, Pertz, i, 205).

These Slavic tribes, as I showed in the former paper, occupied the lower Theiss, the Timok, and the Lower Morava, and it is more than probable that the Bulgarian frontier was now actually pushed to the latter river while the Serbs beyond were doubtless also dependent on the great Krum.

According to one tradition, Krum was succeeded by a chief named Tsokos; another authority makes him be succeeded by Dukum, which may be a form of the same name, and he again by Diceng or Ditzeng (Lebeau, xiii, 10, note, and the prologue and menologium of the Emperor Basil cited by Jiresek, *op. cit.* 146).

Tsokos is said to have put to death Manuel, Archbishop of Adrianople, with some companions whom he first tried to make apostasize. According to Golubinski three other bishops and 374 persons were thus put to death (Jiresek, 140). Kedrenus tells us distinctly that Krum was succeeded by Krytegon, who was much more cruel than himself, and he assigns to him the execution of the Bishop Manuel (Stritter, 563).

We now meet with another Bulgarian king, called Ombritag by Theophylactus, Mortagon by Kedrenus, and the continuator of Constantine, and Omortag by the Frank annalists, and in an inscription to which I shall presently refer. The tremendous victory won by the Emperor apparently exhausted the Bulgarians very materially, and we are told that Omortag, not being able to contend successfully against the empire, determined to send home the other prisoners, among whom were Basil and his parents (*id.*). Roesler would argue that all the people transported by Krum returned again on this occasion, but this is quite incredible, as we have seen the latter transported, a whole nation with all its impedimenta, while the returned prisoners were doubtless some of the grandees who had special ties with the empire.

Omortag at this time made a pact with the Emperor Leo by which he agreed to a thirty years truce, a truce which really lasted for thirty years. Leo swore by the Bulgarian gods, while Omortag swore by the God of the Christians. On the accession of Michael, and the rebellion of his general, Thomas, who laid siege to Constantinople, Omortag wrote to the Emperor offering him his assistance. This the latter refused. Nevertheless, the Bulgarian king, who was probably anxious for some booty, and pleaded the obligations he was under by virtue of the recent treaty, prepared an army, entered the Roman borders, and pitched his camp at Kedoctus, probably the Aqueduct near Heraclea. There he fought a savage battle with Thomas, whom he defeated, and returned home laden with captives and booty; this was in the year 822 (Stritter, 564-6).

Two years later we find Omortag sending envoys to the Frank Emperor, who sent back one called Machelin with them as his representative. About the same time envoys also went from the Obodriti Pradecenti, who lived east of the lower Theiss, to complain of the constant harrying they were subject to on the part of the Bulgarians. The following year fresh envoys went from

Omortag to settle the disputed frontier between the two empires. They were apparently detained in Bavaria for some time, and only admitted to an audience a few months later. This embassy was repeated again in 826, but it was apparently ineffective, for in 827 a Bulgarian fleet went up the Drave, and devastated the country of the Pannonian Slaves, then dependent on the empire, with fire and sword. The Frank officials were driven out and replaced by Bulgarian governors (Eginhardt Annales, Pertz, i, 212–216). In 828 the Bulgarians devastated Upper Pannonia, and as Baldric, Duke of Friauli, had proved himself unfit to cope with the invaders, he was deprived of his province, which was divided into four counties (*id.* 217).

Enhardus, the Fuldensian annalist, tells us further that Louis the Younger was in 828 sent against the Bulgarians. In 829 the latter again sent a fleet along the Drave and burnt several towns within the Imperial borders (Pertz, *id.* i, 359, 360).

The Frank annalists do not give the details of the Bulgarian encroachment upon Pannonia as we would wish, but from a number of facts Schafarik and others have concluded that Syrmia lying between the Save and the Drave, Eastern Hungary from Pesth and the Matra mountains to the sources of the Theiss, together with the district between the Serbian Morava and the Timok, remained subject to the Bulgarians until the irruption of the Magyars (*op. cit.* ii, 176). This I hold with Hunfalvy to be quite improbable. The Bulgarian attacks on Pannonia were mere raids, and I have little doubt that their permanent possessions north of the Danube were limited to Wallachia. I shall have more to say about this in the next paper of this series.

We do not know when Omortag died. In 1858 Mr. C. Daskalof found in the Lavra of the 40 martyrs at Tirnova, which has been altered into a mosque, a rude inscription in Greek letters on a red marble pillar which looks very ancient, and as if it had been in the water a long time. This inscription records the building of three houses or palaces by Omortag near the Danube. There is no date or religious symbol on the pillar, which Jiresek supposes was once placed on a grave mound on the Danube, doubtless the burial place of the chieftain (*op. cit.* 148, 149). The inscription is otherwise interesting as it gives us the correct form of his name.

At this point we reach a very confused period in Bulgarian history,—Jiresek has passed it by without comment and Schafarik throws little light on it. The fact is that we are limited to a passage of George the Monk, which was copied by Leo the Grammarian, and which is singularly inconsequent and contradictory. He tells us that during the reign of the Emperor

Theophilus (*i.e.*, 829–842), the commander of the army in Macedonia was called Cordyles. He, it seems, had been one of the Macedonians transported by Krum, and when he found his way home again had left his son in command of the Macedonians north of the Danube, *i.e.*, of the Vlaks. He now proposed to the Emperor that he should send a fleet which might transport these exiles home again.

About this time Leo the Grammarian says that Baldimer, *i.e.* Vladimir, the grandson of Krum and father of Simeon, was the ruler of Bulgaria. The father of Simeon was the Tzar Boris or Bogoris who was therefore the same person as the Baldimer of this account. Boris is said by Constantine Porphyrogenitus to have been the son of Presia, and the probability is that Presia was in fact the successor of Krum. Of him we only know that, according to Constantine, he fought for three years against Vlastimir, or Vladimir, the ruler of the Serbians, without any result (Stritter, ii, 154). Let us now turn to the statement of George the Monk. He tells us that when Cordyles made the proposition above named, Baldimer (or Boris) was absent at Thessalonica, and the captives took advantage of the opportunity to set out with their goods. Baldimer now returned, crossed the Danube and attacked them. Driven to despair they put Tzantzes and Cordyles at their head, resisted and killed some of the Bulgarians and captured others. Unable to recross the river they appealed to the Hungarians, here called Ouggroi, and who are now mentioned definitely for the first time. Meanwhile the Imperial flotilla arrived. At this juncture the Macedonians noticed a vast body of Hungarians coming towards them and threatening them. They offered to allow them to embark if they would abandon their property to them. As they refused to do this, a struggle ensued, and the Hungarians were put to flight. They then embarked and arrived safely in Macedonia (Stritter, ii, 566, 567; Lebeau, xiii, 183, 184). Here, again, we have a mere handful of people. It is incredible that any flotilla at the command of the Greek Emperor should have transported more than a mere fraction of the crowds who were carried away by Krum. There is one word in the statement of Leo which has caused some difficulty. He refers to the Bulgarian king in one passage as Komes. Now it is curious that in the inscription of Mortagon already referred to he is styled Giom Mortagon. Can this be the Bulgarian form of the title Khan?

In 843, when the throne of Byzantium was occupied by the Emperor Michael the Third, under the tutelage of his mother Theodora, we find Boris threatening to invade the empire; but on receiving a martial reply from the empress he agreed to renew the pact which his predecessors had made. Theodora now

sent to redeem a monk called Theodore who was surnamed Kuphar, and who had been made captive, while Boris similarly sent to ask for the return of his sister who had been captured by the Greeks long before, and was then living in the palace. She, it seems, had become more or less a Christian, and now sought to influence her brother, who had heard something of the faith from the monk Theodore (Stritter, ii, 568, 569). This religious proselytism was not altogether an effective peacemaker, for we read of the Bulgarians making a raid upon Macedonia in 852 in which they suffered severely (*id.* 569, 570). But this was a solitary break in a really long truce. The next year Boris was at issue with the Franks. He had sent embassies to Louis the German in 845 and 852, probably to complain about an invasion of his borders. These were followed in 853 by a hostile movement, in which his people, who were in alliance with the Slavic subjects of Rastislaf, then the ruler of Moravia and Slovakia, were defeated (Ruodolphus Fuldensis Pertz, i, 364-367; and Prud. Trec. *id.* 448).

Boris had another war on his hands against the Serbians, in which he tried to revenge his father's defeat by Vlastimir, and attacked the latter's sons Muntimir, Stroemir, and Goinik, but he was defeated, and his own son Vlastimir or Vladimir was captured, together with twelve war engines.

This disaster induced him to come to terms. He was then in the Serbian land, and as he feared some ambush on his way home, he was escorted as far as Rasa, *i.e.*, Novi-Bazar, which was on his frontier, by Borena and Stephen, the sons of Muntimir, who were rewarded by rich presents, and in turn gave him two maidens, two falcons, two dogs, and 90 skins, as was the fashion of making peace among the Bulgarians. Presently civil strife arose between the three Serbian Princes, and Muntimir, having won the day, sent his two brothers captive into Bulgaria, retaining as hostage Peter, the son of Goinik, who soon after escaped to Croatia (Stritter, ii, 155 and 575, 576). Stroimir married a Bulgarian wife. During the reign of Muntimir in Serbia, many of his people were converted by missionaries sent by the Emperor Basil, and we are told that both the Serbs and Croats now acknowledged their dependance on the empire (Stritter, ii, 92).

Constantine Porphyrogenitus mentions that Boris had a struggle with the Croats, in which he was not very successful, and agreed to a peace (Stritter, ii, 600).

We now reach a notable event in Bulgarian history, namely, the conversion of its king to Christianity. This took place, according to Schafarik, who has examined the chronology of these events with some pains, in the year 861 (*op. cit.* 181, note 2).

From the Byzantine writers we learn that Bulgaria, being afflicted by famine and pestilence, the Emperor Michael marched against it, whereupon Boris, probably for political reasons, determined to become a Christian. Peace was accordingly arranged with the Emperor on the terms that Boris was baptized and received the name of Michael, no doubt after the Emperor, while the Greeks made over to him what their annalist describes as the sterile district, from the pass of Sidera (*i.e.*, Demirkapu or Vratnik near Sliven), as far as the coast town of Debeltus, called Zagora, in Slavic, and which was situated near Burghas (Jiresek, *op. cit.* 153, 154).

A curious Saga which has been dissected by Golubinski makes out that Boris was converted by a painter named Methodios, who painted a picture of the Last Judgment so realistically, that the King was frightened and was led to change his faith, but the mistake has really arisen, as this author has shown, from a confusion of a painter named Methodios with Methodios the Apostle of the Slaves (*id.* 154).

The latter was not improbably the chief instrument in spreading Christianity in Bulgaria at this time, and Schafarik argues from the Moravian legends of Cyrillos and Methodios, the life of the Bulgarian Clement, and the testimony of Diokleatos, that he in fact preached the Gospel in Bulgaria before he went to Moravia in 862 or 863 (*op. cit.* ii, 181, note 2), thus confirming the statement of the Byzantine author. The pact between Boris and Rastislaf of Moravia did not last long, for in 863, while we find the latter assisting Carloman, the son of Louis the German, who was the Governor of Carinthia, in a rebellion against his father, we are at the same time told that Louis was assisted by the Bulgarians (Ruod. Fuld. Pertz, i, 374). Carloman having submitted, Louis and Boris went against Rastislaf, with whom they made a treaty of peace at Tulln, on the Danube, which held good during the rest of the century (Jiresek, 151). The Franks and Bulgarians, however, had a quarrel of their own, and Hincmar tells us Louis marched against the Bulgarian Khan who had promised to become a Christian (Pertz, i, 465). In 866 envoys went to Louis at Ratisbon from the Bulgarians, among whom, according to the Bertinian annals, was the son of the Bulgarian King, and reported that their Khakan had become a Christian, and asking that teachers might be sent (Annals of Fulda, i, 379). Another notice says that the King had been baptised the year before. Louis accordingly sent Ermanric Archbishop of Passau, with priests and deacons to spread the faith in Bulgaria; but when they arrived they found the ground already occupied by evangelists from Rome, who were baptizing and preaching everywhere. They therefore returned home again (*id.* 380).

The contradiction in dates, &c., between the Frankish and Byzantine authors at this time is, perhaps, due to the confusion that then reigned in the religious world in these parts. As Jiresek says, Bulgaria was looked upon by all creeds as an Eldorado where spoil could be secured, and Boris, who was probably a Christian from policy, swayed backwards and forwards in his loyalty to the creeds of Rome and Byzantium. He also had a struggle with his own bolyars, who did not wish to be converted. A rebellion in fact broke out, and 52 of the stiffnecked were killed, and a death blow given to heathenism. Among those anxious for converts in Bulgaria were Jews, who had large colonies at Thessalonica, in the Crimea, and among the Khazars. There were also Monophysites, and especially Paulicians, who were introduced into Thrace by Syrian and Armenian colonists from Syria. Peter Siculus, who went as a Byzantine envoy in 868 to the Armenian Tefrica, was told by the Paulicians there that they had the intention of sending some of their number to try and reconvert the newly converted Bulgars from the Greek faith to their own. Peter dedicated a work he wrote against the Manicheans, which is still extant, to Joseph, the first Archbishop of Bulgaria. Meanwhile strange positions were occupied by the orthodox; one body of Bulgarians set up as their leader a layman who had baptised them. Some of the Greek Popes or Priests forbade bathing on Wednesdays and Fridays, others the eating of flesh of animals which had been killed by eunuchs, &c. (Jiresek, 155, 156). But the great feud was between the Latin and Greek creeds. Boris was apparently afraid that Greek bishops in Bulgaria might be the precursors of Greek domination there, and we accordingly find him, in 866, appealing to the Pope, and as we have seen, to the Frank Emperor, for missionaries. His envoys to the Pope took a document embodying 106 requests, some of which were naive enough, for instance, whether in future they would be permitted to wear trowsers (*femoralia*). They also especially pressed for the appointment of a patriarch of their own, an embarrassing request which the Pope cleverly evaded by saying he first proposed to send some Bishops to make inquiries (Jiresek, 156). Pope Nicholas accordingly sent the Bishops Paul and Formosus, with a company of priests. Whereupon the Popes of the Greek rite were driven out (Jiresek, *op. cit.* 156), but a difference shortly after arose. Nicholas having died, his successor Hadrian II claimed the right to appoint the Bulgarian Archbishop. The latter nominated Sylvester to the post, while Boris claimed it either for Formosus, or for the deacon Marinus. Meanwhile a revolution took place at Constantinople, by which Basil, who was a Slave by birth, and as we have seen had been a prisoner

among the Bulgarians, mounted the throne. In conjunction with the Patriarch Photius, he began a struggle with Rome which speedily developed into the Great Schism, as it is called. A Council was summoned at Constantinople, to which Boris who was at issue with the Pope, sent as his representatives Peter, Zerbulas, Zundikas and Twentarus (Schafarik, ii, 183).

This Council, which is referred to sometimes as the 8th General Council, was attended by Legates from the Pope. It met in the year 869; one of its most important acts was the deposition of Photius, and it widened the breach with Rome. An important subject of debate was the question as to which patriarch the Bulgarian Church was subject to. Before the invasion of the Bulgars, their country had formed a part of the Eastern Empire, but in ecclesiastical affairs had been ruled by the Archbishop of Thessalonica, who was the deputy of the Bishop of Rome. The Greeks argued that Bulgaria ought to follow the fortunes of the Empire, and that Rome in submitting to the Frank Kings could not carry over the allegiance of the Bulgarians. The Council eventually decided in favour of the supremacy of Constantinople, and the Papal Legates returned homewards much chagrined; they were waylaid and plundered *en route* by the Slave pirates of the Adriatic. The bishop sent to Bulgaria by the Pope also returned home again. The result of the Council was in fact to definitely attach Bulgaria to the Eastern Church (Lebeau, xiii, 267, &c.).

The Archbishop Theophylactus was sent with a following of priests into Bulgaria, several sees were founded, while a number of bishops apparently had no dioceses, and are referred to as "Episcopi regionarii." The Archbishop of Bulgaria was treated with special honour at Byzantium, and assigned the seat next the patriarch. And Boris' son Simeon was sent to the Imperial capital, where, according to Liutprand, he studied the works of Demosthenes and Aristotle, and acquired the soubriquet of "the Semi-Greek," and the Pope wrote and wrought in vain to try and bring back Boris and his people to their old allegiance to himself (Schafarik, *op. cit.* ii, 183, 184; Jiresek, 157, 158).

In 871 the famous Sviatopolk mounted the throne of Moravia. He laid a heavy hand on all his neighbours, and in 882 we find him fighting with a united body of Franks and Bulgarians. The result of his several wars was to make him master of Western Pannonia and to make his borders conterminous with those of Bulgaria (Schafarik, *op. cit.* ii, 405; Jiresek, 159). It was under his patronage that Methodios the Slave evangelist worked. The latter died in April 885. On his death his various scholars were dispersed and many of them sought shelter in Bulgaria where they were gladly welcomed by Boris, and renewed their good

work at his court. Among these fugitives there was named Gorazd, Klemens, Laurentios, Naum, Sava, Angelar, &c. (Jiresek, 160). We now meet with another contradiction between the eastern and western writers. One account says that Boris retired to a cloister and handed over the government to his son Vladimir, who reigned for four years, when his ill-doing caused his father to come out again from his retirement. He thereupon deposed Vladimir, had him beheaded, and gave the government to his younger son Simeon. This is reported in the legend of St. Clement, and in some epitomes written in Cyrillian characters (Schafarik, ii, 185, note 2). Sigebert also mentions this, and suggests that the young prince wished to reintroduce paganism (Pertz, vi, 241). The Byzantine authors know nothing of Vladimir, and they mention Simeon as ruling in 888; on the other hand, the Fulda annals distinctly refer to an embassy sent to Vladimir by Arnulf to renew the alliance against Sviatopolk and to prevent the Moravians from obtaining salt from Bulgaria. (Fulda annals sub an. 892; Jiresek, 160.) Having put Simeon on the throne, Boris once more returned to his cloister. He died on the 2nd of May, 907, and we must now turn to the history of his famous son the great Tzar Simeon, whose reign is the golden period of Bulgarian history. With his accession the peace between Byzantium and Bulgaria which had lasted so long came to an end. The cause of this strife was that a eunuch named Musicus, in the service of one of the principal officials named Zautzas, who had united with two Greeks named Stauracios and Cosmas, obtained the monopoly of exclusive trading with the Bulgarians, which traffic for their convenience was transferred from its ancient seat at Constantinople to Thessalonica. There, removed from supervision, they grievously oppressed the Bulgarian traders. Simeon having complained of this to the Emperor Leo the Wise, and obtained no redress, prepared for war (Stritter, ii, 576, 577; Lebeau, xiii, 340). The Roman armies were set in motion under Procopius, surnamed Crinites, but were speedily defeated in a battle which was fought in Macedonia. Their leaders were killed, while a number of Khazars, who had gone to the Emperor's help, having been captured, had their noses cut off, and were then contemptuously sent to Constantinople. The Emperor thereupon despatched the patrician Niketas Sclerus to the mouths of the Danube to arrange an alliance with the Turks, (*i.e.*, the Magyars, whom the Byzantines call Turks). He succeeded in arranging terms with Arpad and Kosan, or Kersan, the Magyar leaders (*id.* 578).

The Emperor now sent a fleet and the domestic legion to assail Bulgaria. This was in the third year of his reign (*i.e.*, in 888 and 889), and we are merely told that they penetrated as far

as Bulgaria. The expedition was apparently not very successful, and Leo sent an official to arrange about peace. Simeon imprisoned this envoy and prepared to resist. Meanwhile the Hungarian allies of the Greeks invaded Bulgaria and succeeded in retiring behind the Danube again with their booty. Simeon went to the rescue. He had fixed some chains to prevent the Greek vessels from drawing near and assisting, but these chains were broken and the Greeks passed through. The battle which followed was a fierce one. Simeon was badly defeated and many of his people were killed. This was near Silistria; the captives made by the Hungarians were redeemed by the Greeks, their allies, probably preferring to be paid for their services in gold rather than slaves. Simeon took refuge at Mundraga (?) while the enemy ravaged the land as far as Preslaf, when they again retired. At this time we are told the Turks (*i.e.*, the Magyars) were commanded by Liuntina, the son of Arpad (Stritter, ii, 578, 579). Roesler identifies this name as a corruption of Lewenta, which often occurs in later history. (Romanische Studien, 160, note 1). Simeon now made advances for peace to the Emperor, who thereupon withdrew his armies and fleet. Having secured this end, he followed the retiring Hungarians and inflicted defeat upon them (*id.* 580, 581). The Fulda annals which mention this, call the Hungarians Avars, and date the campaign in 895-6 (Pertz, i, 412). They forced easy terms upon the Emperor, in which the latter surrendered the captives he had made. Leo, as Lebeau says, in this war, gained the questionable glory of ransoming the Bulgarian prisoners from the Hungarians and handing them back again to Simeon without ransom (*op. cit.* xiii, 346). Nicephorus Phocas, the famous Imperial general, having died some time after, namely, in the year 891, Simeon siezed the opportunity and speedily found an excuse for war, on a charge that the Emperor had retained some of the prisoners, and he sent a demand for their restoration. He invaded Thrace and fought a bloody battle with the Greeks at Bulgarophygos, not far from Adrianople, in which the latter suffered a disastrous defeat (Stritter, 580, 581).

This terrible battle, in which the Greek army was practically annihilated, was fought in the year 892.

Having made peace with the Greeks, Simeon determined to crush the Hungarians, who, we are told, were at this time absent on a warlike expedition, meaning, doubtless, the attack they made on Sviatopulk, in conjunction with Arnulf in 892. Having made a league with the Pechenegs, they drove away the few Hungarians who had been left behind to guard their houses, and harried their wives and families. The Hungarians having returned and found their houses wasted, migrated into Pannonia.

After the battle of Bulgarophygos there was peace between the Bulgarians and the empire during the remaining years of the reign of Leo, who died in 911. During this peaceful interval Simeon performed the part of a patron of literature. It was a fertile epoch in its way. Bishop Constantine, Pope Gregory, John the Exarch, and the Monk Khrabr were busy, but the Slave historians complain that culture then meant Byzantine culture, and that we have no relics of poetry or other national literature at this epoch. From Bulgaria this Byzantine culture passed to Russia and Servia respectively (Jiresek, 164, 165). Bulgarian Christianity was at this time infected with various heresies, Arians and Manichees appear to have existed largely (*id.* 165). Simeon's capital was Great Preslaf, the Roman Marcianopolis, four hours' journey west of Sumen. There still remain its ruins about the village of Preslava, called Eski Stambul by the Turks, and now comprising but 200 Bulgarian and 100 Turkish houses. John the Exarch speaks in glowing terms of the Bulgarian capital and of its palace and churches, and contrasts the stone and diversely coloured wood of which its buildings were made, the pictures, the decorations in marble, copper, gold, and silver with the poor straw huts of his own country. He describes Simeon himself as sitting in his pearl-bedecked garments, with a chain made out of coins (*grivna cetava*) about his neck, with armlets on his arms, a purple girdle about his waist, and a golden sword by his side, and around him his bolyars decked with golden chains, girdles, and armlets (*id.* 165, 166). But the glory of Preslaf has long ago departed. Even when the Turkish geographer Haji Khalfa wrote, who died in 1658, there were only ruins to be described near Sumen, besides a great wall which is compared in its circuit with that of Constantinople (*id.*)

On the death of the Emperor Leo, Simeon sent envoys to his brother and successor, Alexander, to offer him his continued friendship. These envoys having been received with scant courtesy, Simeon prepared for war, when the death of Alexander postponed it. All this occurred in 912 (Stritter, *op. cit.* 582). Alexander was succeeded by his nephew Constantine Porphyrogenitus, then a boy of seven years old. Simeon, whose pride was doubtless galled by the treatment his envoys had received, continued his preparations. He marched with a large army to the gates of Constantinople, where frightened by the fortifications and the war machines upon them, and by the show of resistance, he withdrew to Hebdomos. Negotiations for peace were now commenced. The young Emperor's tutors having repaired to Blakhernas, where Simeon's sons were invited to sup with Constantine, the Greek patriarch Nicholas

was introduced to the Bulgarian King, put his stole over his head, and blessed him. Terms of peace were not, however, arranged, and the Bulgarians returned home without securing them (*id.* 583, 584). This year, Peter, the son of the Venetian Doge, Participatius the Seventh, on his return from Constantinople, where he had been well received, was arrested on the frontier of Croatia by Michel, Duke of Slavonia, who plundered him and handed him over to the Bulgarian King, from whom his father had to ransom him (Muratori Annal. v, 270, 271; Lebeau, xiii, 403). Constantine was a minor, and the Empire was governed by his mother Zoe. This was a good opportunity, and Simeon again marched southwards, invaded Thrace, and besieged Adrianople, which was surrendered to him by its governor, the Armenian Pancrutukas, who had been bribed. The city was recovered by Zoe from the Bulgarians, in the same manner (Stritter, *op. cit.* 584, 585). The Greeks now found a new ally. One John Bogas undertook to secure the alliance of the Pechenegs, who had recently driven out the Hungarians, if he was made a Patrician. He set out with a number of gifts and returned successful, taking with him hostages and a promise that the Pechenegs would cross the river when the empire was assailed by the Bulgarians (Stritter, *op. cit.* ii, 584). Having bought peace from the Saracens by the payment of a considerable tribute, the Empress removed the troops which were in the East to Europe, determined to crush the Bulgarians, and distributed *largess* freely among them. The army was officered by some of the most distinguished Greek officials, and before it set out it was assembled in a plain at the gates of the city, when the soldiers on their knees swore before the Archbishop of the palace, who held a portion of the true cross in his hands, that they would conquer or die. The army advanced into Bulgaria, and encountered the enemy at the river Achelous, near Mesembria. At first the Bulgarians were defeated, but in the pursuit one of the Greek generals having dismounted to quench his thirst, and his horse having escaped, his people who saw it riderless, were panic stricken. The Bulgarians turned upon them, and utterly defeated them with great slaughter. There seems to have been considerable jealousy among the Greek commanders. The Admiral Romanus Lacapenos had been ordered to the Danube to transport the Pechenegs across the river, but he refused to co-operate, and the Pechenegs returned home in disgust; there was a suspicion that he and Leon Phocas, the general of the land army, were striving as rivals for the Imperial throne itself (Stritter, *op. cit.* 586-588; Lebeau, xiii, 411, 412). Leon Ducas, with the débris of his army, now fell back on Constantinople, and was followed by the Bulgarians. Another

fight took place at Catasyrtes, in which the Greeks fought bravely, and the result of which was that Simeon retired with his people from before the capital (Stritter, ii, 589). These struggles took place in 917.

The result was altogether a very serious one for the empire, as we shall show presently. Simeon appropriated the greater part of Macedonia, leaving to the Greeks little more than the seaboard, while the latter had the misfortune to see the throne of Byzantium made the plaything of two rivals, Leon Phocas and Romanus Lakapenos. For a while Simeon turned his steps elsewhere. We have seen how Muntimir became the ruler of Serbia. He apparently died about 890, leaving three sons, Pribislaf, Bran, and Stephen. Pribislaf succeeded him, but was driven away in the course of a year by his cousin Peter, the son of Goinik, whom we have named above. It was while the campaign on the Akhilous was in progress that the Prefect of Dyrrakhium, Leo Rhabdukhus, went to Pagania to concert some measures with Peter, who was then the ruler of the Serbians. Probably this meant an alliance against the Bulgarians. Moved by envy, Michael, Prince of the Zachlumi (*i.e.*, Michael Wyschewit, who reigned from 912-926 in Zachlumi or Herzegovina) informed Simeon that the Roman Emperor had sent to arrange an alliance between Peter and the Hungarians, who were jointly to invade his borders. Furious at this news, Simeon sent an army under Theodore Sigriztes and Marmaeen, which seized Peter and carried him off. Michael put Paul, the son of Bran, on the throne of Serbia (Stritter, *op. cit.* 600, 601), and he doubtless became more or less a dependent of the Bulgarians.

In 921 we again find Simeon making a raid upon the Imperial borders, and the next year apparently the Bulgarians advanced under a leader named Khagan (*i.e.*, the Khakan), by whom Simeon is probably meant, and another chief named Menik, and reached Manglaba. The Emperor sent a large army, together with a naval contingent under Alexis and Muzelaeus, against him. The Greeks encamped near the sea, and were surprised by the enemy, who suddenly appeared on the surrounding heights when they thought they were far away. The Imperial generals were panic stricken, and fled, and a terrible rout ensued, almost the whole army being either killed, drowned, or captured. The Bulgarians set fire to the Palace of the Fountains, a beautiful country house of the Emperors', and having pillaged the district up to the walls of the city, retired with a great booty (Stritter, *op. cit.* 590-2; Lebeau, xiii, 426, 427). The following June they again returned, and pillaged and destroyed the palace of Theodora the wife of Theophilus, outside the city walls. The Emperor now summoned his principal officers to a grand feast, when

under the influence of wine and excitement they promised great things. One of them, Sactices, who commanded the night guards, rashly set out with only his company at daybreak. He surprised the enemy's camp while the Bulgarians were scattered abroad pillaging, and killed the guards whom he found there; but the rest of them were speedily summoned, and slaughtered his band. He escaped, but was mortally wounded, and was buried in the church of St. Sepulchre. Simeon now again withdrew, but he had planned a more crushing campaign. He entered into an alliance with Fatlum, the Khalif of the Arabs of Kairvan (in Tunis) by which he undertook to attack Constantinople by land, while the Saracens assailed it by sea. The two were to divide the booty, and Simeon was to retain the city. The envoys of the Khalif were returning with those of Bulgaria to ratify the treaty, when they were seized in Calabria, and taken before the Emperor, who having imprisoned the Bulgarian envoys, released those of the Khalif, saying it was thus Romanus revenged himself on the enemies whom he esteemed. This superficial chivalry had the desired effect of conciliating the Khalif, and of causing him to renounce his alliance with the Bulgarians (Lebeau, *op. cit.* 430, 431; Jiresek, 168, 169).

Some time after—the year is uncertain, Jiresek dates it in 923, Lebeau in 925, and Stritter in 927—Simeon is found laying siege to Adrianople, where the patrician Leo commanded who had not failed to molest the Bulgarian borders. He bravely defended the town until famine pressed upon it, when the citizens surrendered it with their commander to the enemy. Simeon put him to death after subjecting him to torture, and having left a garrison there withdrew. This garrison fled on the approach of a Greek army which had marched to the rescue (Stritter, 593, 594; Lebeau, 432). The next year (924, 6, or 8) Simeon again marched through Thrace and Macedonia ravaging the country and destroying even the trees in his way. Having arrived before the gate of Blakhernas he demanded a conference to settle matters with the empire. Romanus sent the patriarch Nicholas and other grandees to the Bulgarian camp, but Simeon insisted on a *tête-à-tête* with the Emperor himself, whose equity and prudence he declared he knew well. Romanus was very anxious for peace. He had the imperial galley rowed into a shallow creek, and having enclosed a space round it with palisades, offered to meet his opponent there. The latter, or rather probably some of his wild subjects whom he doubtless found it very difficult to control, set fire to a famous church dedicated to the Virgin. Meanwhile Romanus repaired to the Church of our Lady of Blakhernas where he gave himself up to prayer, and removing

a famous mantle which was reputed to have belonged to the Virgin, he put it on as a cuirass under his imperial robes and then repaired to the rendezvous. Thither Simeon also went, with an immense cavalcade, their arms glistening with gold and silver, and singing the praise of their ruler, the spectacle being watched by a great crowd on the walls of the capital itself. The Emperor awaited the arrival of Simeon, whose people inspected the vessel to prevent a surprise. Romanus is said to have spoken his friend a homily on the evils of blood-shedding, which is reported at some length by the chroniclers, and to have told him that if his motive was booty that he would willingly pay a considerable black mail to secure peace (Stritter, *op. cit.* ii, 595-598; Lebeau, xiii, 433-436). Peace was at length agreed upon, and Simeon received some lordly presents from the Emperor. As the terms were being settled two eagles are said to have approached one another in the air and then to have parted company, one going towards the city and the others towards Thrace. This was accepted as an omen that the peace would not be lasting. It, however, lasted longer than the augurs probably suspected. Simeon turned his arms elsewhere. I have described how Paul, the son of Bran, acquired the throne of Serbia as his protégé. To check-mate this the Emperor Romanus, who claimed suzerain rights over Serbia, and who had given an asylum to the son of Pribislaw named Zacharias, sent him to try and secure the throne, but he was captured and sent in chains to the Bulgarians (Stritter, *op. cit.* 601). Three years later Paul, having proved unfaithful to his Bulgarian patron, sent Zacharias, who drove Paul away and occupied the principality. Once on the throne he sided with his former protector the Emperor, and drew upon himself the vengeance of Simeon, who sent an army under Marmaes and Theodore Sigriztes. They were defeated, and their heads and weapons were sent as trophies to the Roman Emperor. This happened before the Romans and Bulgarians had made peace. To revenge the mishap Simeon collected a fresh armament and sent it under Cuenus, Hemnek, and Etboklia. Zacharias now deemed it prudent to retire to Croatia, while the Bulgarians assembled the Župans and ordered them to come together and do homage to Zeeslab, whom Simeon had appointed their ruler. They were then seized and carried off in chains to Bulgaria. The Bulgarians entered their land and laid it waste. They carried off all the inhabitants save those who found refuge in Croatia, and the country for several years was left vacant. Simeon now sent an army under Alogobotur against the Croatians, by whom, however, it was defeated, and apparently annihilated (*id.* 602). This blow seems to have been too much for the great Tzar, for he died on the 27th of May, 927. His death

was a most serious blow to the Southern Slaves. If he had lived, or if he had been succeeded by princes of the same martial character, it is very probable that a great Slave state reaching from the Adriatic to the Black Sea, which would have been a barrier to the Turks, might have been formed south of the Danube. As it was, the empire he virtually conquered broke to pieces and became disintegrated. The Tzar Simeon was the Alexander of Bulgarian history. We do not propose to carry the story further. We will now bring together such facts as we can collect about the separate sections of Bulgarian Slaves. As we have seen, the Bulgarians on entering Mœsia conquered the country as far as the frontier of the Avars, which Schafarik explains as the junction of the Save, Theiss, and Danube, and thence concludes, with reason, that among the Slavic tribes they conquered and incorporated were the so-called Eastern Obodriti, the Branitshani, Kuchani, Timociani, and probably also the Severani. Hincmar tells us that in 866 (probably it ought to be 861) on the occasion of Michael Boris becoming a Christian, ten gaus rebelled against him. These gaus Schafarik suggests occupied Bulgaria proper from the Timok to the sea. Of their names we can only recover two or three, which occur in the Frank annals, and which were situated in the north-west of Bulgaria, namely, the eastern section of the Obodriti, the Gudusceni or Kuchani, and the Timociani. I have already described the Eastern Obodriti in a previous paper of this series, and would here only add that they are mentioned by the often quoted Bavarian geographer, who calls them Osterabtrezi, and who tells they possessed more than one hundred towns (Schafarik, ii, 208, note 3), proving what a powerful stock they were. Some of the towns in the district still preserve traces of their early names, as Bacs called Pagatzi by Kinnamos in 1163; Zemlin, at the junction of the Save and Danube called Zeugmin by Kinnamos, and Zeugnimon by Niketas Khoniatas, Sombor, etc. The Gudusceni or Kuchani and the Timociani we have also considered in the former paper. The so-called Bulgarian Morava has for its feeding streams the Wrana, the Toplitza, the Taren, and the Tempeshka; the Serbian Morava is fed by the Ibar. The country between the Ibar and the eastern branch of the Morava, and the district watered by the whole river after the junction of the two head streams, the Serbian and Bulgarian Morava, which is now entirely occupied by Serbs, belonged until the ninth and tenth century to the Bulgarians, and only became Serbian in the twelfth century when the great Zupan Stephen Nemanja conquered it and secured the important towns of Prish-tina, Nish, &c. (Schafarik, ii, 212). The dialect is still somewhat sophisticated there. It is probable, says Schafarik, that the part

of this district bounded by the Timok, the Danube, and the Morava was secured by the Bulgarians on their conquest of Moesia in 678, while the rest of the district between the Serbian and Bulgarian Morava, and beyond the Morava to the Drina, was only added to Bulgaria by Michael Boris. Dardania (*i.e.*, the district on the Binch Morava) belonged to Bulgaria in 869 (*op. cit.* 212). The whole district as far as the Drave was called Moravia, or rather, to distinguish it from Moravia in Northern Hungary, Lower Moravia. At the synod held at Constantinople in 878, an archbishop signed himself *Ἀγαθὸν Μωραβίων*, together with two other Bulgarian bishops, Gabriel of Okhrida, and Simeon of Debeltus. He was probably the Agathon sent as an envoy to the Franks by the Emperor Basil in 873.

The Bavarian geographer, after describing Bohemia and Marharii (*i.e.*, the Northern Moravia), goes on to speak as follows: "Vulgarii regio est immensa et populus multus, habent civitates V., eo quod multitudo magna ex eis sit et non sit eis opus civitates habere. Est populus quem vocant Marehanos" (*i.e.*, no doubt the southern or Nether Moravia); "ipsi habent civitates xxx." Then follow the Osterabtorezi. In Serbian writings of the thirteenth and fourteenth century, Nether Moravia occurs frequently, as in the life of St. Simeon, written by St. Sawa in 1208, where it is called Pomoravya. In 1382 it is styled Moravye (Schafarik, ii, 214). At the sources of the Binch Morava is a town Morava, called Morowisdos by Kinnamos, in 1018, in the following passage cited by Stritter: "venerunt et legati Bulgarorum e Pelagonia (Polog) et Morobisto (now Morava) et Lipenio (now Liplyan) ad imperatorem et urbes ei dedunt" (Stritter, ii, 641). In 1342 we read of a "loco Moravo ab indigenis nuncupato," as far as which the Serbian King Dushan conducted his sister Helena (*id.* 861, Schafarik, ii, 215). Kedrenus, speaking of the Bulgarian, Peter Delan, in 1040, says, "Usque ad Morabum et Belegrados pervenit, qua sunt castella Pannoniæ ad Istrum" (Stritter, ii, 650.) St. Sawa founded a new bishopric in Moravia in 1224. This see was probably situated on the river Morawiza, where the monastery of Morawce, in the modern Rudnish, is still to be found.

Several distinct districts are mentioned in this southern Moravia, *intrr alios* Nischawa (1153), called Nikawa by Kinnamos, connoting no doubt the country round Nisch, and Dendra mentioned also by Kinnamos in 1156, doubtless the Slavic Dubrava, which is mentioned as a gau in 1381 (Schafarik, ii, 215). Of the towns in the district the most important is Belgrade, the Singidunum of the ancients, where in 885, according to the life of St. Clement, lived the Bulgarian chief Boritakan (*id.*). Kham, a stronghold on the Danube,

mentioned in 1123 by Niketas Khoniata, now Ram. Rawanitza, mentioned in 1096, 1172, and 1189, and called Rabel by Ausbert, Arnold, &c., and said to be situated "in Silva Bulgarica." Smolinyec, a place near Branitshevo, called Smeles in 1154, by Kinnamos. Zuetshan, called Sfentzanion by Anna Comnena in 1081, and Swetzanion and Sfeiamon by Khalcokondylas. It was on the borders of Bulgaria and Serbia. Liplyan, very probably the ancient Ulpiana, called Lipenion in 1018, by Kedrenos, Lipainion by Theophanes and Anna Comnena, and Liplyan by St. Sawa, under which name it still exists. Prishtina called Prisdiana in 1073, by Skylitzes and Theophylactus. It is curious that no name of any gau in Bulgaria proper is known.

The well known Dobruja or Dobritch, on the right bank of the Danube, at its outfall is first mentioned by Khalkokondylas, in 1444. It originated from its possessor Dobrici, who lived about 1388 (Schafarik, ii, 216), but we are told a place called Dobritsh, in the Bulgarian Moravia, is mentioned in the chronicle of Archbishop Daniel in 1330.

Of the Bulgarian rivers we find the Tytscha most frequently named in the chronicles. It is called the Tunza by Theophanes in 764, the Tumtza by Kedrenos, and the Tytscha in the MS. of the Monk Tudor at Dok. It is probably to be identified with the Ditzina, named by Constantine, in 949, the Bitzina of Anna Comnena. Under these various names it seems likely that the Dewna, which falls into the sea below Varna, is meant.

The most important Bulgarian towns were Preslaf called Presthlawa, Preshlawon, Persthlawa, Persthlawa, Parasthlawa, by the Byzantine writers; Pereyaslawiz, by Nestor and Praslaf in a deed of the Tzar Assan in 1186. It was the ancient Mar-
kianopolis, and is now in ruins. It was the capital of the Bulgarian kings until the subjection of Bulgaria in 971. Shumen, the Turkish Shumla, is identified by Schafarik with the so-called Aula Crumi, or Palace of Krum (mentioned in 802-815), and with the Buleuterion and Symeonis vertex of Anna Comnena. Provat, near Prislaf, is mentioned in 1186 by George Akropolit. Pleskof, called Pliskova, Pliskuva by the Byzantine authors, Leo the Deacon, Kedrenos, and Zonaras, in the year 971, was situated near Preslaf, but its site is not known. Varna, so well known to us, is mentioned as early as 678 by the Byzantine authors ("Warna urbs, Odesso vicina," says Theophanes.) Ditschin on the Danube is probably the Dinia or Dinogetia of Leo the Deacon. Kiyewez, also on the Danube, named by Nestor (967-971), is now unknown. Dristor, Derstor, Destor, called Drestwin by the Russian annalists, Darstero by Gundulit, and Dristra, in

889, by Leo the Grammarian, the ancient Dorostolas, is called Silistria by the Turks. Rakhowa (Bulgarian Rakhua, Reachuwa, Reachuwitza, Oryechowa, Oryekhowitza) is the name of two towns, one on the Danube, the other near Tirnovo, mentioned, in 1306, by Pachymeres. B'dyn, B'din, called Bydinum by Theophylactos in 1071, Bidini by Kedrenos, B'dyn in a deed of the Tzar Assan of the year 1186, and B'din by Archbishop Daniel, is the well known Widin, perhaps also the Widez, Widizof of the Russian annals. Lowez is mentioned in 1049 by the Byzantines under the name Lowitzon. Demnitzikos, mentioned as situated on the Danube in 1148, by Kinnamos, is not now known. Tirnof or Tirnovo, mentioned as early as 1185 by the Byzantine authors, was the capital of Bulgaria from the year 1180. Sredez, called Serdika by Theophanes in 809, Triaditza by Leo the Deacon and others in 987, Stralitzia by Ausbert and William of Tyre, is the modern Sophia called Sardika, and Serdika by the ancients. Boron, mentioned by Kedrenos in 1015, was probably on the Boyan near Sredez (Schafarik, ii, 217, 218).

Having examined the topography of the Bulgarian land, we will now conclude with a notice of the idiosyncracies of the Bulgarians, which are traceable to their partially non-Aryan descent.

Our story began with the conquest of the Slaves of Mœsia, who, like their brothers elsewhere, were a settled race of agriculturists, by the warlike and nomadic Bulgars, who were of Hunnic descent. The Slaves, apparently, have a singular facility for amalgamating with their neighbours, and swallowing them up. Thus we find the Bulgars speedily adopting the customs and the language of the conquered Slaves, and becoming Slaves, in fact, in all but two important particulars, one was their name. They retained their old denomination and continued to be styled Bl'gare, in the singular Bl'garin, by the Serbs Bugare, and by the Russians Bolgare. The other feature in which they remained somewhat apart from the other Slaves was in their physique. In a number of photographs of the upper strata of Bulgarian society, some time ago shown me by my good friend, Mr. Arthur Evans, of Ragusa, the Ugrian or Turanian type of feature was very marked. It was this class which probably was alone of Ugrian descent, the lower strata of the population remaining largely Slavic. The amalgamation of Ugrians and Slaves to form the present Bulgarian nation took place gradually. Many of the early chiefs bore names clearly of an Asiatic type, as Kubrat or Khrobatus, Batbaia, Kotragus, Alticeus, Alzeko, Kuber or Kuwer, Asparukh or Isperuk (perhaps a Persian name), Terbelia, Komesius or Komersius, Teletzes, Sabinus, Paganus, or Bavanus

Umarus, Toktus, Tzericus, Kardamus, Krumus, Mortagon Presia, Boris, Almus (compare the Hungarian Bors and Almus), Ahmed, Talib, Mumin, Boilas Tzigatus, Marmaes, Kninus, Izboklia, Alogobotur, Konartikinus, Bulias Tarkanus, Kaluterkanus, Krakras, Elemagus, Kaukanus, Boritakan, Echatzis, Dobetas, Billa, Boksu, Heten, Organa, &c. (Schafarik, ii, 166, 167). Examine, again, the names of several districts occupied by the Bulgarians of the Danube, as Bular, Kutminziwi, Kotokiumi, &c. (*id.*), and some words in use among them, as Ropat, a prayer house (compare the Arabic Ribat or Robat) Boilades, nobles (compare the Avar Beled), Aul, the throne or seat of the prince (compare the Kirghiz aul, meaning the same thing, in Magyar ol=stabulum) welermit, silk, &c. (Schafarik, ii, 167). We will now collect such other Eastern characteristics as chroniclers have preserved.

The Bulgarians were essentially a warlike race. Their frontiers were protected by many fortified forts, and no one, whether a free man or a slave, dared to leave the country under penalty of a severe punishment, and if any one escaped, the frontier guards paid the penalty with their lives. According to the reports of the Arabs, their land was surrounded with a thorn hedge, with wooden gates. The several villages, however, were not so surrounded. As a standard they used a horse's tail, like the Turkish bunsuk, and the Mongol tugh or tuk. They only fought on lucky days. Before setting out a trusty officer was sent round to inspect the arms and horses, and where they were found defective, the owners were punished with death. Before their battles they performed certain incantations, &c. ("incantationes et ioca et carmina et nonnulla auguria").

Those who fled from battle, or were disobedient to orders, were cruelly punished. According to the report of the Arab Masudi, the Bulgarians used neither gold nor silver money, but cattle and sheep were their units of value in trading. In times of peace they were accustomed to sell Slave boys and girls as slaves at Constantinople. The ancient Bulgarian polity was founded on an aristocratic basis. The chief was styled Khan, and was assisted by a council of six nobles, who were styled Boilades or Boliades, whence some, says Jiresek, derived the Slav title of Bolyars or Bolerin (nobles). This title is used among the Russians and Bulgars, and has passed from them to the Rumans and Albanians. According to the court etiquette the Byzantine envoys first inquired after the health of the Khan, his wife, and children. Then after that of the Bulias Tarkhan, of the Konartikin, and of the six great Bolyars, then after the other nobles, and lastly after that of the whole people. Of the noble families we have recorded the names of four in the frag-

ment already quoted, namely, those of Yermi, Ugain, Ukil or Vokel, Dulo. Many of the nobles' names end in *bul*, whence the old Slave *bul* (boliar) is perhaps derived.

Mohammedanism, which had made considerable progress in Great Bulgaria on the Volga, had also planted itself in the Danubian Bulgaria. In a document of Pope Nicholas dated in 866, he speaks of Mohammedan books in use among the Bulgars ("libri profani, quos a Saracenis vos abstulisse ac apud vos habere perhibetis"). The Pope ordered them to be burnt. Mohammedans in Bulgaria are also mentioned in a Bulgarian Nomocanon of the thirteenth century, in which Mohammed is called Bochnit.

The Bulgarian language subsisted for a considerable period apart from the Slavic; thus in the life of Saint Demetrius, written in the eighth century, we read that the Bulgarian king sought among his councillors for men who could speak Greek and Slavic (Schafarik, *op. cit.* ii, 168; Jiresek, 134, 135), while among the writers of the eighth century Bulgarian and Slavic divisions of troops are clearly discriminated (Jiresek, 133-135.)

The rites performed before his battles by Krum have their counterparts in the later history of the Mongols. We are told how he "more gentis sacrificio instructo (profano et vere daemoniaco) homines ac pecora plura immolavit, tinctisque ad maris litus pedibus ac aqua lotus, lustratoque exercitu, faustis suorum vocibus omnibusque exceptus, per medium pellicum gregem iis venerationis ergo procumbentibus ac laudantibus processit" (Stritter, ii, 554).

The early Bulgarians were polygamists, at least some of them had two wives. As a dowry they gave their wives gold and silver, cattle and horses, &c. The princes possessed harems. In regard to their costume we learn that men and women both wore wide trousers, and women as among the Mohammedans veiled their faces. The men shaved the head smooth and wrapped it in a turban ("ligatura lintei, quam in capite gestatis") which was not removed during worship. According to Suidas the dress of the Bulgarians was like that of the Avars (*id.* 132). They ate flesh, but only of such animals as they deemed clean, and from which blood had flowed when they were killed. When any one was ill they had recourse to superstitious cures; ribbons were hung from his neck, or small stones were administered as medicine. The bodies of their chiefs, according to the report of the Arabs, were burnt or buried in tumuli, in which their wives and servants were also enclosed and suffocated. Their justice was of a very crude type. If a man was caught committing robbery and refused to confess, the judge beat him on the head with a club or ran iron into his legs, as long as he remained obdurate. The steal-

ing of cattle and slaves was severely punished, and executions were very frequent. Nobles who rebelled not only lost their lives and property, but their children and dependents were similarly punished. The etiquette of the court had an Asiatic character. The prince took his meals out of a separate dish, not even his wife shared it. The grandees ate at some distance from the prince, sitting on stools or kneeling on the ground. They used their enemies' skulls as drinking cups. The left was the side of honour. On the conclusion of a contract the oath was sworn over a bare sword while dogs were meanwhile cut in pieces, a practise still well known in Siberia.

We have now completed our survey of the Bulgarians and shown how close akin they are to the Serbs and Croats, all having an aristocracy or upper class of Ugrian descent which is closely connected in blood with the Hungarians. In the next paper of this series we shall deal with the Slaves of Macedonia, Greece, and Southern Hungary.

MAY 24TH, 1881.

Major-General A. PITT RIVERS, F.R.S., *President, in the Chair.*

The Minutes of the last meeting were read and confirmed.

The following list of presents was read, and the thanks of the meeting voted to the respective donors :—

FOR THE LIBRARY.

- From Lieut.-Colonel R. G. WOODTHORPE, R.E.—Report of the Exploration of the Angami Naga Country. By Dr. R. Brown.
 ——— Rough notes on the Angami Nagas and their Language. By Captain John Butler, B.S.C.
- From J. W. POWELL, Esq.—Abstract of Transactions of the Anthropological Society of Washington, D.C.
- From the GERMAN ANTHROPOLOGICAL SOCIETY.—Archiv für Anthropologie. Band. XIII, 3.
- From the SPANISH ANTHROPOLOGICAL SOCIETY.—Antropologico, No. 5.
- From the BERLIN ANTHROPOLOGICAL SOCIETY.—Zeitschrift für Ethnologie, 1881, Hefte 1, 2.
- From the SOCIETY.—Proceedings of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, March, 1881.

Anal.

THE
JOURNAL
OF THE
ANTHROPOLOGICAL INSTITUTE
OF
GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND.

VOL. VII.

LONDON:
PUBLISHED FOR
The Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland,
BY
TRÜBNER & CO., 57 & 59, LUDGATE HILL.

All Rights Reserved.

1878.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
BEDDON, Dr. JOHN. Aborigines of Central Queensland	145
BROCA, Dr. PAUL. Opening Address to the French Association for the Advancement of Science at Havre Congress, 1877	187
BROWNE, Mr. A. J. JUKES. Flint Implements from Egypt	396
BUCKLAND, Miss A. W. Primitive Agriculture	2
BURTON, Capt. R. F. Flint Flakes from Egypt	323
—— More Castellieri.. ..	341
CARMICHAEL, Mr. C. H. E. On a Benedictine Missionary's Account of the Natives of Australia and Oceania.. ..	280
CLAPHAM, Dr. CROCKLEY. The Brain-weights of some Chinese and Pelew Islanders	89
CLARKE, Mr. HYDE. The Himalayan Origin of the Magyar	44
DAWKINS, Prof. BOYD. The Evidence afforded by the Caves of Great Britain as to the Antiquity of Man	151
DISTANT, Mr. W. L. Anthropological Gleanings	543
EVANS, Dr. JOHN. On the Antiquity of Man	149
—— Discovery of Palæolithic Implements in the Valley of the Axe	499
FLOWER, Prof. W. H. Note on Eskimo Skulls	539
FOX, MAJ.-GEN. A. LANE. Discovery of a Dug-out Canoe in the Thames at Hampton Court.. ..	102
—— On Protection of Ancient Buildings	186
—— Preservation of Ancient Monuments and Antiquities in Ohio	186
—— Observations on Mr. Man's Collection of Andamanese and Nicobar- ese objects	433
HOWORTH, Mr. H. H. The Ethnology of Germany, Part II. The Ger- mans of Cæsar	211
—— The Ethnology of Germany, Part III. The Migrations of the Saxons	293
—— The Spread of the Slavs, Part I. The Croats	329
HAMILTON, Mr. A. GAVIN. Customs of the New Caledonian Women	206
HARRISON, Mr. J. PARK. Additional Discoveries at Cissbury	413
HOLT, Mr. ROBERT B. The Earthworks of Portsmouth, Ohio	132
HUGHES, Prof. T. McK. On the Evidence afforded by the Gravels and Brick-Earth.. ..	162
HUNTER, Capt. F. M. Notes on Socotra	364
KNOWLES, Mr. W. J. Flint Implements and Associated Remains found near Ballintoy, co. Antrim	202

	PAGE
LAWES, Mr. E. On a Kitchen Midden found in a cave near Tenby, Pembrokeshire	84
LEWES, Mr. A. L. Rude Stone Monuments in North Wales	118
—— Rude Stone Monument in Kent	140
MCLCAN, Rev. HECTOR. The Scottish Highland Language and People ..	65
MAN, Mr. E. H. The Andaman Islands	106
MARTIN, Mr. E. B. Objects from a supposed Kitchen Midden in Smyrna	138
MORTIMER, Mr. J. R. On an Underground Structure at Driffild, Yorkshire	272
RAE, Dr. JOHN. On Eskimo Migrations	125
—— On Eskimo Skulls	142
ROSS, Rev. W. On Curious Coincidences in Celtic and Maori vocabularies	123
SIMSON, ALFRED. Notes on the Zaparos	502
TIDDEMAN, Mr. R. H. On the Age of the Hyena-Bed at the Victoria Cave, Settle, and its bearing on the Antiquity of Man	165
TOPINARD, Dr. PAUL. On Anthropology	540
TURNER, Rev. W. Y. On the Ethnology of the Motu	470
WALHOUSE, Mr. M. J. On Non-Sepulchral Rude Stone Monuments ..	21
WESTROPP, Mr. HODDER M. On a Kitchen Midden at Ventnor	83
WHITMER, Rev. S. J. On some Characteristics of the Malayo-Polynesians	372
Annual General Meeting	511
Index	549

grounds some three years ago, picked up a fine specimen of a saw, measuring two and a-half inches; and arrow heads are spoken of. Worked flakes and roughly-shaped spear-points have also been collected on the opposite river-bank. At Zâwiyat, Ariyân (naked men's corner?), about five miles above the pyramids of Gî'zeh, lies the platform of a similar feature, now ruined; and here, near the place where the saw came to hand, Mr. Hayns lately discovered a flake which appears to be a scraper.



For remarks upon the collection of flint implements at Bulák see the "Notice des Principaux Monuments," &c. Le Cairo, Morirès, fifth ed., pp. 81-2.

I have great doubts concerning the little collection which is herewith forwarded. To me only one flake, round which I have tied a thread, appears as if worked. The others look like mere *éclats*, which may be due to the causes which have overspread the Libyan desert with millions of specimens, numbers which, as Drs. Schweinfurth and Günfeltdt remark, completely forbid our attributing them to art. However, your practised eye may correct my hasty judgment, and I am anxious to learn the result of your examination.

TRIESTE, June 19, 1877.

RICHARD F. BURTON.

The following papers were then read by the Director in the absence of the Authors—

THE SPREAD of the SLAVES. Part I.

THE CROATS.

By H. H. HOWORTH, Esq., F.S.A.

By your favour I have recently commenced a series of papers on the ethnography of Germany; I find it difficult to proceed in this work without at the same time considering the migrations and changes which the Slavic races have been subject to. Germans and Slaves being close neighbours, with frontiers frequently shifting and overlapping, it is almost impossible to understand the revolutions which have overtaken the one race, nor to map out its details correctly, without at the same time

surveying its neighbours. I therefore propose to write a number of papers concurrently with the series on the Germanic races, in which I shall treat of the ethnography of the Slaves: and I find it convenient to begin with the Croats.

The synonymy of the Croats has been collected with great patience by Schafarik, and from his classic work I take the following list of synonyms. By the Emperor Constantine Porphyrogennitus, they were called Chrobatoi; by Cedrenos Khorbatoi; by Zonaras, Krabato; by Nicephorus Bryennios, Khorbatoi by Khoniates, Khrabatia; by Khalkokondylas Krokatioi. The Arab Masudi calls them Khorwatin. A gau in Karinthea is called Crawati in an early document. In deeds of 954 and 978 they are called Khrowat; by Dithmar Khruwati; by the "Annalista Saxo," Krowate; in the Saxon Chronicle Kruwati; a village Crubate is mentioned in 1055; another Gravat in 1086; the land of Kurbatia by Lupus Protospathes; Chrowati by Cosmas of Prague; Cruacia by Martin Gallus Croatii by Kadlulek. Alfred the Great calls them Horithi; Croatæ and Croatia occur in native documents of 892, 925, 1076, and 1078; Chrobatæ in a deed of 1059, etc. In the Cyrillian legend of Saint Wenzel, dating probably from the tenth century, the name is written Khrbate, Khorbate, Khrabate; Khrobate by Nestor in the copy written in 1377; Khrbate in the oldest Servian MSS.; Khrbaten in an old Bulgarian MS.; Harwati, in the Dalmatian Chronicle of Diokleas, Kharwati in Dalimil, etc.

The Croats pronounce their own names Hr'wati, Horwati, The Serbs and Illyrians call them Hr'wat, plural Hr'wati. In both cases, as in the words hrabren, hrast, hren, hvala, hud, etc., h stands for the old ch. The Hungarians call them Horvatok, the Germans, Kroats, and Krobats.

The original form of all these names is Khr'watin in the singular, and Khr'wati in the plural, and according to all authorities known to me, including Schafarik, is derived from the Carpathians, which in old Slavic were named Krib, or Khrebet. This word means a mountain or hill, and occurs in composition in many Slavic localities, as Slovenski hribi in Steiermark; also several places in Russia, as Khriby, a village on the Kolpinka, and the Khribian woods and marshes in the same district; Khrebine, a village west of Vladimir, etc. From Khrib we get Khrebet, the term applied generally to large mountain ranges by the Russians, as Yablonoi Khrebet, Uralskoi, Khrebet, Kamskatskoi Khrebet' etc. (*Id.*, i, 488.) Croat therefore means merely an inhabitant of the Carpathians. According to Schafarik, the whole of the northern slopes of these mountains, stretching from the Sutschawa to the sources

of the Vistula, was known from the fifth to the tenth century as Khrby, and sometimes, by the permutation of consonants, Khrwy, or Khrwaty (*id.*), and this is the region, according to the best authorities, whence the Croats originally came.

The author to whom we are indebted for the first notice of the migration of the Croats, is the Emperor Constantine Porphyrogenitus whose notice has been sifted with great critical acumen and skill by Schafarik, the author of the "Slavonic Antiquities." Constantine tells us how in the reign of the Emperor Heraclius, the Avars having driven the Romans out of Dalmatia, and that province having been converted into a desert, the Chrobati, by the Emperor's invitation, entered that country, drove the Avars out, and settled there. Schafarik dates the invasion of the Avars about the year 630, and their expulsion about 634. (*Op. cit.*, ii, 241.) "Previously the Chrobati lived," says the Emperor, "beyond Bagibaria, where still live the Belo Khrobati" (*i.e.*, the White Khrobati), which doubtless means the Free Khrobati, as distinguished from the Black or subject Khrobati. In another place he tells us that in his day these White Khrobati still lived in their own land, near the Franks, and subject to Otho the Great. In a third place, where he describes the old country of the Servians, he tells us it was situated beyond the land of the Turks (*i.e.*, the Magyars), and was called Boiki, and was near Francia and Great or White Khrobatia. (Stritter, ii, 157 and 390.) As Schafarik says, there is much ambiguity in these apparently distinct statements. Boiki has been often supposed to represent Bohemia; but the land whence the Servians came was called Boiki by themselves; while as is well known, Bohemia has always among the Slaves been called Cheky. Again, Constantine does not write the name Boiké, as he would have done if he wished to connect it with the Boii, but Boiki (indeclinable, as was the custom of the Greeks in writing barbarous names). Schafarik concludes, as I think most justly, that by Boiki there is no reference to Bohemia, but a reference to the Russian tribe of the Boyki (Russian. Boyki, singular Boyok), who still live in Eastern Galicia from the Dniester to the Pruth, in the district of Sambor and Stryi, in the lower part of Stanislawof, and Kolomyi, and also scattered in the district of Chorkof and very probably still further north. Constantine's putting Borki in the neighbourhood of the land of the Franks, was perhaps due to some confusion in his own mind between Boiki and Bohemia.

Constantine in another place describes White Croatia as situated beyond the Turks, which with him means the Hungarians.

Again, as to Bagibaria, some would make it equivalent with dwellers on the Wag or the Bug; others a corruption of Babi-egorbo, an old name for the Carpathians; (Stritter, ii, 389, note.) Others again connect it with Bavaria; Bavaria then stretched as far as the Danube, and Gallicia might well be described as being beyond Bavaria and the land of the Turks (*i.e.*, of the Magyars). (*Id.*, ii, 243.)

On turning to other authorities, we find this conclusion amply supported. Nestor, the first Russian chronicler, in speaking of the times before the arrival of the Varagians, names the Khorwati in close proximity with the Dulyebii, who lived on the Bug, and the Tiwertzi who lived on the Dniester. And he distinctly calls them Khrobate biele, or White Croats. In describing the campaign of Oleg against the Greeks, in 906, he mentions how he was assisted by contingents of men from the Varagians, the Slovenians, the people of Novgorod, the Chudes, the Kriwichi, the Mera, the Polani of Kief, the Derewani, the Radimiches, the Severani, the Wiatiches, the *Khorwati*, the Dulyibii, and the Tiwertzi. "These Khorwati," as Schafarik says, "no doubt were the White Khorwati, who lived beyond the Carpathians. In 981 Vladimir declared war against Mechislaw of Poland, apparently to reconquer certain places in Gallicia which had been won by Oleg, but had been re-occupied by the Poles. He took the towns of Cherwen (now called Czerno), on the river Guetzwa, Peremysl, etc. Oppressed on all sides, the Croats tried to regain their independence." (Schafarik, ii, 105.)

In 993 we find Vladimir undertaking a fresh war against them, whose issue is not stated.

Besides these proofs, we have as remains of the former occupation of this district by Croats, the names of certain places, as the villages of Horb, Horbok, Horbof, Horbowiza, Horibatche, Zahorb, Hrbitschi, Hribowa, Hrichowze, and more doubtfully, Khrewt, in the circle of Sanock; Kharwin, and four villages called Kharsevitze in Eastern and Western Gallicia, etc. (Schafarik, *op. cit.*, ii, 106.)

Zeuss argues very forcibly that the name patria Albis given by the Geographer of Ravenna to the flat country north of the Carpathians, is not to be explained as the country of the Elbe, but as the white land, and as equivalent to the White Servia and White Croatia of the Byzantines. ("Die Deutschen und die Nachbarstämme," 610.) He also mentions that north of the mountains, although west of the ancient White Croatia, we meet in mediæval times with traces of the Croats; thus we find Cosmas of Prague, under date 1086, in mentioning the border districts of the diocese of Prague north-west of Bohemia, near the gau of Troppau, speaking as follows, "Ad aquilona-

lem hii suut termini: Psouane, Ghrouat, et altera Chrouati, Zlasane, Trebouane, Boborane, etc." (*Id.*, 610.) These Croats are probably referred to in the legend of St. Wenceslaus, where we find that Drahomira fled to Croatia. This was in 936. (Schafarik, *op. cit.*, ii, 444.) They would also seem to be the Horithi of Alfred. (*Id.*) It is possible that these Croats were not a section of the White Croats, but received their name merely from living in the chribty or mountains. There can be small hesitation however in accepting the neighbourhood of Gallicia north of the Carpathians as the cradle land of the Croats.

Invited by the Emperor Heraclius, as I have mentioned, the Croats set out under the leadership of five brothers, named Klukas, Lobel (Lobelos), Kosenetz (Kosentsiz), Muchlo, and Khrwat (Khorvalos), and two of their sisters, named Tuga and Buga. Some suspicion has been cast on these names. Khrvat seems to be the eponymos of the race; two others of them mean tarrying; while the two girls' names are equivalent to joy and sorrow. (Evans, "Bosnia," etc., xx.) But the names do not seem to me to be other than perfectly natural ones. They entered Dalmatia, and having fought for some time against the Avars, who inhabited that district (*i.e.*, from about 634 to 638), they killed some and some they subdued, and from this time the Croats occupied that country. The Avars were not entirely dispersed, and the emperor tells us that when he wrote, three centuries later, remains of them were still to be found there who retained their name of Avars. (Constan. de adm. Imp., 30; Stritter ii, 389.) Schafarik suggests that the Morlaks, who have been by several writers made out to be of Tartar or Kirghiz origin, are really descended from these Avars. He also suggests that it was from this fact that Avar, title of Ban, was first adopted among the Croats, and afterwards by other Slavic races. (*Op. cit.*, ii, 278, and note 2.)

In regard to these Morlaks, Sir Gardner Wilkinson collected some curious information. He says the first notice of them is about the middle of the fourteenth century, when they would seem to have been the occupants of the mountainous district of north-western Bosnia. After that period they migrated with their families and flocks from Bosnia as the Turks advanced there; and immediately before their settlement in Dalmatia, their principal abodes were in the districts of Corbavia and Lika, to the north and north-east of the River Zermagna. "Though of the same Slavonic family as the Croatians," he says "and others of that race, some have supposed a difference in their appearance, and a superior physical conformation." This he

assigns to their hardy life and pure climate. Farlati supposes the name to be compounded of Greek and Slavonic, and that it was originally Makro vlahi, and that they received the latter name from their dark or black colour. Some have indeed called them Black Latins. ("Historicus Dalmata," vi, 5.) This etymology is much more reasonable than that adopted by Wilkinson from mor the sea; and vlah, a term given in Slavonic to all those who do not speak German, and even to the Latins, and which is the root of Valachi Wallachians. (Wilkinson, "Dalmatia and Montenegro," ii, 296.) An inland race of mountaineers would scarcely receive a name derived from the sea; and the former derivation is very consistent with the theory, quoted from Schafarik, which makes the Morlaki descendants of the Avars. It would be curious to examine their dialect from this point of view, and now that so good and enthusiastic a student of Slavonian as Mr. Evans lives at Ragusa, we may perhaps hope that an inquiry in this direction may be made. As to the title of Ban, Schafarik says, that Bayan was a title in use among the Avars, and was used of a subordinate dignity to that of Khakan or Khan, and it is almost certain that the Slaves derived it from the Avars. (*Id.*, ii, 278, note.) He adds elsewhere that it is probably derived eventually from the Persian Bayan. (*Id.*, ii, 257, note 3.) Wilkinson says the principal nobles of Hungary Bohemia in the middle ages were called Pan; the same title was given in Poland to the first dignities of the State, and it now means Lord, Mr. or Sir. (*Op. cit.*, i, 25.) The Austrian Governor of Croatia is still known as the Ban.

So far as we know, the Croats were the first Slaves who permanently settled in Dalmatia, in Pannonia beyond the Save, and in Präwallis. There had been several previous raids of Slavic invaders into these districts in 548, 550, 551, and 552, but these were only temporary invasions, and the Croats were the first to actually settle there. (Schafarik, ii, 237.) Although Constantine does not tell us that they settled down as dependants of the empire, it seems almost certain from their subsequent history that they did so. (*Id.*, 278, note.) A portion of the Croats who entered Dalmatia detached itself from the main body, and occupied Illyria and Pannonia. (Const. Porphyry, *op. cit.*; Stritter, ii, 391.) This detached body seems to have settled, in fact, in that part of Pannonia situated between the Danube and the Save, and known as Pannonia Savia, with its chief town at Sisek, and partly also in Illyria, where there was subsequently a Croat gau. (*Id.*, 279.)

There were thus constituted two Croat States, one in Dalmatia, with its chief towns of Belgrade (Zara Vecchia), on the Adriatic;

and Bihatsch on the Una; and a second whose capital was Sisek at the junction of the Kupa (Kulpa) and the Save. According to Constantine, the boundaries of the land possessed by the Croats of Dalmatia were, on the south, the river Zetina and the towns of Imoski and Liwno. On the east, the Urbas, with the towns of Yazye and Baynaluka. On the north the Drave, the Kulpa, the town of Alibunon, and the Arsia in Istria; and on the west the Adriatic. (Stritter, ii, 395, note; Schafarik, *op. cit.*, ii, 279.) They also doubtless occupied several of the Dalmatian islands and the Istrian peninsula, whose inhabitants speak the Croatian dialect. (Schafarik, *id.*) In Croatia, Constantine says there were eleven Zupas, *i.e.*, gaus: Chlewiana, *i.e.*, Chlewno (the modern Liwno, in Herzegovina); Tsentsina (Zetina); Imota (Imolski near the Zetina); Plewa (the modern Pliwa); Pesenta (the mountain of Wesenta, south of the Yayze); Parathalassia (Primorye, a district between the Zetina and the Krka) Brebera (Bribri, between the Krka and Lake Karin); Nona (Nin, on an island in the strait of Puntadur); Tnina (Knin, on the river Krka); Sidraga (the district of Belgrade or Zara Vecchia); Nina (the district on both sides of the Dzirmanja, including the town of Byelina); Kribasa (the later county of Krbarva); Litsa (the military district of Lika); Gutsika (the open country of Gazko.) (Schafarik, *op. cit.*, ii, 295-6.) The three last gaus were subject to the Ban, an officer of whom I shall have more to say presently.

From the names of these gaus and the towns which they enclosed, it would seem, says Schafarik, that the division of Dalmatian Croatia did not reach northwards to the Sen and the Otoschatz; and this northern frontier strip from the Arsia and from the mountain Alibunon (Yawonirk?) to the Kulpa, belonged to the other section of Croatia, whose princes had authority as far as the Danube and Syrmia. Croatia therefore was bounded on the north by the Wends, who as early as 631 had gained possession of Friauli on the north-east (Schafarik, by a *lapsus penicilli* says north-west) by the Pannonian Avars, and on the east and south by the Serbs; from whom the latter were separated by the rivers Urbas and Zetina; and it included the modern districts of Turkish Croatia, Dalmatia and some of its islands, a part of the military frontier, and of Austrian Croatia, Istria and Carinthia.

Schafarik remarks that it is well to remember that there were certain towns on the coast which having been for a long time subject to the Greek Empire, secured for a while their independence, but ended by becoming tributary to the Croats. These were Rausium or Ragusa, called Dubrownik by the Slaves; Tranggurium, *i.e.*, Trogir or Trau; Diadora, *i.e.*,

Zader or Yadera ; and the islands of Arbe, *i.e.*, Rab ; Wekla, *i.e.*, Kark or Kerk ; and Opsara, *i.e.*, Osero or Absorus. To these towns and islands and the neighbouring district, the name Dalmatia now became more and more restricted, in order to distinguish them from the neighbouring Croatian districts proper ; and their inhabitants, as Constantine tells us, retained the name of Romani or Romans. (Schafarik, ii, 280.) Their descendants are still well known as the so-called Italians of the Dalmatian coast.

Having considered their country, let us now turn to the history of the invaders. When he had persuaded them to settle down on his frontiers, the next thing which the Emperor Heraclius was solicitous about was the conversion of the Croats to Christianity. He accordingly applied to the Pope, who sent a number of priests to baptise them. Their prince at this time was named Porga, the son of one of the five brothers already named. Porga is a curious and uncommon name, apparently not Slavic ; and Schafarik compares it with Purgas, the name of a Mordwin chief mentioned in the year 1229 (*op. cit.*, ii, 280, note), a fact which makes it probable that the Croats were at this time subject to alien princes, perhaps of Avar descent.

The conversion of the Croats by missionaries of the Latin Church, and not by those of the Eastern Church, became a very important fact in later days, and a fact which still forms a notable element in that congeries of political difficulties, the Eastern Question. The Pope who was reigning at the time was John the Fourth who entered into close relations with the new converts, put them under the protection of the Holy See, and made them promise, probably, at the instance of the Byzantine Court, to abstain from making any attacks on other countries. This promise they further ratified in writing, and it was honestly carried out. Being restricted from making aggressive wars, they partly occupied themselves in agriculture, and partly in trade, their ships frequenting the various towns on the Adriatic. (Schafarik, ii, 281.) They accordingly became rich, and their country populous. Constantine tells us they had a force of 60,000 cavalry, and 100,000 infantry ; 80 ships, each manned by 40 hands, and 100 others, with lesser crews of 20 and 10 men. (Stritter ii, 396). He tells us also there was an archbishop and a bishop among them, with priests and deacons. Through their influence and that of several other ecclesiastics, notably John of Ravenna, Archbishop of Spalato, they were not only grounded in the faith, but were also closely attached to the Empire. According to Thomas, Archdeacon of Spalato, the first bishoprics created in Croatia were those of Dubno (Deluminium) and Sisek (Siscia). (Schafarik, 281, note.) We thus find the Croats attached

politically to Byzantium, while their religious ties were with Rome. Unlike their Slavic neighbours, they were never subject to the kings of Bulgaria, with whom, however, they lived on amicable terms. We have hardly a notice of the Croats during the next one hundred and fifty years; in fact, the only reference to them during this interval, given by Schafarik, relates to an invasion of Apulia by a host of Slaves who came from the Adriatic. "*De Venetiarum finibus*," are the chronicler's words; as they are said by the annalists to have gone with a multitude of ships, it is probable they were Croats. (Schafarik, 282, note 1.) We do not meet with any further references to their country till we come to the days of the Frank conqueror "Karl the Great." Having conquered the Lombard kingdom in 774, and ravaged Friuli in 776; he then in his struggle with the Bavarian prince Tassilo and his Avar allies, overran the Wendish districts on the Ens in the Tyrol, Karinthia, and Istria. This extension of the Frank arms led inevitably to their speedily overshadowing the Croats. The rivalry between the Byzantine and Romish churches had begun its work, and was at this period intensified by the ill-feeling between the Greek Emperor and his grandees. On the bloody defeat of the Byzantines in Italy in 788, the Franks overran Istria, Liburnia, and Pannonia on the Save. They annexed these districts as far as the Danube, and appointed Marquises or Margraves and Counts there, on whom the native Slavic chiefs became dependent. This was in 789. Thus the Grand Prince (Veliki Zupan), who had his seat at Sisek, became a Frank subject. The Franks gave him the title of rector, and made him immediately dependent on the Marquises of Friuli. It was probably from this event that the district of Syrmia was called Frankokhorion, while the town now called Mandyelos, the Budaliia of the Romans, received the name of Frankavilla. (*Id.*, 283.) Hitherto the Dalmatian towns had not been interfered with; according to Eginhardt, this was because of the friendship of his master for the Byzantine Emperor (Egin. "*Vitæ Car.*:" Pertz, i, 451); but in the year 806, Paulus, Duke of Zara, and Donatus, bishop of the same town, went to him with rich presents, and also apparently with their submission. (Eginhardt; Pertz, i, 133.) This change of masters led to considerable ill-feeling between Karl and the Emperor Nicephorus. This was terminated by a treaty in 810, by which the latter transferred his now merely nominal sovereignty over the Dalmatian Croats to the Frank Emperor, while he retained control over the towns of Zader, Trogir, Spalato, Ragusa, and the islands of Osero, Rab, and Kerk, *i.e.*, of the district now called Dalmatia. (Schafarik, 282-3).

Thus the Croats became to a large extent subjects of the

Frank Empire. On the death of the Great Karl, the Franks began a somewhat persecuting policy towards them. In 817 a dispute arose between Kadolach, Duke of Friauli, and the Byzantine Emperor Leo the Armenian, as to the boundaries of Dalmatia. The Greeks presented their complaints on this matter to the diet held in 817 at Aachen, and the Emperor sent Albgar the son of Miroch, to settle matters on the spot. (Eginhardt, "*Annales*" sub ann. 817.)

Kadolach appears to have treated the Croats on the Save very arbitrarily, and Liudewit their prince sent an embassy with complaints to the diet at Vannes. (Eginhardt, "*Annales*," 818.) No notice having apparently been taken of his complaints, he rebelled, and an army was sent against him, which seems to have been partially successful, and Liudewit sued for peace. As his terms were not reciprocated by the Emperor, he persuaded the neighbouring Wends and also the Timociani, who had recently fallen away from their allegiance to the Bulgarians and submitted to the Emperor, to rebel. Meanwhile, Kadolach, the Marquis of Friauli, caught the fever and died, and was succeeded by Baldric, who marched into Carinthia, where he encountered the army of Liudewit, and having defeated it on the Drave, drove him out of that province.

He was attacked on another side by Borna, the chief of the Dalmatian Croats, who was apparently in alliance with the Franks. The struggle took place on the River Culpa, but Borna was deserted by the Guduscani, and was defeated. In this battle Dragomus, the father-in-law of Liudewit, who had been treacherous to his son-in-law, and had deserted him, perished.

Borna, on his retreat homewards, succeeded in reducing the Guduscani once more to obedience. In the winter Liudewit invaded his borders, and ravaged them with fire and sword. Borna, however, revenged himself, killed 3,000 of the enemy, captured 300 of their horses, and recovered much booty. (Eginhardt, "*Annales*," 819; Pertz, i, 205-6.) Thus did the Croats imitate a very common policy among the Slaves, and tear each other's throats, while the Empire stood by approvingly.

In January, 820, it was determined at an Imperial diet, to send three armies simultaneously into the country of Liudewit. Borna assisted at this diet with his advice. One of these armies marched through the Norican Alps; a second by way of Carinthia; while the third went through Bavaria and Upper Pannonia. The first and last were obliged to return again, but the one which marched through Carinthia defeated the enemy three times, and crossed the Drave; but Liudewit defended himself bravely, shut himself up in his capital; and the Franks

contented themselves with devastating the country round, and then retiring. They had however struck terror into some of the rebels, for we read that the people of Carniola who lived about the Save, and close to Friauli, submitted to Baldric; and the Carinthians, who had sided with Liudewit, also submitted. (Eginhardt, "Annales," ad ann. 820.)

Meanwhile Borna the chief of the Dalmatian Croats, died. He is called dux Dalmatiae et Liburniae by Eginhardt. He was succeeded by his nephew Ladislavl. The Franks once more entered the country of Liudewit and ravaged it in 821. In 822, they sent another army, on the approach of which he was constrained to fly from his capital Sisek, and to escape to the Servians (Schafarik says probably to Bosnia); Eginhardt tells us he there murdered one of the princes of the country, and appropriated his territory. He then sent envoys to the Franks. (Eginhardt, "Annales," 822; Pertz i, 209.) He had however again to fly, and now escaped to Dalmatia, where having lived for some time with Liudimysl, the uncle of Borna, he was at length put to death by him. This was in 823.

This ended the independence of the Croats on the Save, who were now united with the Dalmatian Croats.

This internecine war among the Croats was due no doubt partly, as Schafarik says, to the jealousy created by a section of them being subject to the Franks, and another section independent; but I believe another reason not referred to by that historian was, that the Croats of the north were still very largely pagans, while their southern brothers were Christians. The Frankish raids to which it gave rise were accompanied with terrible barbarity, and the Emperor Constantine tells us how even children at their mothers' breasts were killed and thrown to the dogs. They kept up the struggle however with the persistence of their race, killed their prince Liudimysl the Frankish *protégé*, and also, according to Constantine, the Frank commander Kozilimis. This war took place during the years 825-30, and during the reign of Prince Porin. Being once more free the Croats turned to the Pope, asking him to send people to baptise them, and also asking for bishops. (Constantine Porphy.; Stritter, ii, 392.) Porin ruled over the whole of the Croats on the Adriatic, whose borders extended probably as far as the modern Slavonia; under him was a Ban who had authority over three gaus. Slavonia itself, *i.e.*, the country between the Drave and the Save, or at all events its eastern portion, was at this time subject to the Bulgarians, who had pushed their authority beyond the Drave. (Schafarik, ii, 286.)

The various towns of Dalmatia which had been subject to the Greeks, fell away during the reign of Michael the Second

(820-29), and Zader set up an independent dux or doge of its own. (*id.*, 286; Stritter, ii, 88.) On Porin's death, he was succeeded for a short space by Moislaf, who in 836 renewed the peace with Peter Tradonico the Doge of Venice. His successor Trpimir in 837 ratified the gift of certain revenues which had been made by his predecessor Moislaf to the church of Split or Spalato, and the deed by which he did it is the oldest one extant relating to the Croatian princes. In his days there came from the neighbouring Frank districts (*i.e.*, from Istria and Carniola) a pilgrim named Martin, dressed in secular garb. He did many wonders, and although a pious person, he was infirm and lame in his feet, and was carried about by men. He devoted himself to the conversion of the people, and was so successful, that they desisted from acts of piracy on their neighbours, and ceased attacking them except in self-defence, and we are told the Croats became attached to seafaring, and frequented the coast as far as Venice. (Constantine Porphyry; Stritter, ii, 394-5.) Unlike the neighbouring Slaves, the Croats were never subject to the Bulgarians, nor did they even pay them tribute. They only had one struggle with them, in the days of Michael Boroses of Bulgaria, who failing to beat them, made peace with them, and gifts were interchanged. (*Id.*, 395.)

Between, 868 and 878, we find that Sedeslaf or Sdeslaf, a relative of Trpimir's, and a *protégé* of the Byzantine Emperor Basil, the Macedonian, was Prince of Croatia. He was probably a usurper, for Trpimir left sons behind him. During his reign, the Croats again became dependent on Byzantium, and transferred their ecclesiastical sympathies from the Pope of Rome to the Patriarch of Constantinople. (*Id.*, 287.)

The chief reason for this, was the publication of the Slavic Liturgy in the Cyrillic character in Bulgaria, Pannonia and Moravia, which so pleased the neighbouring Croats and Serbs, that they sent to ask teachers from the Emperor Basil, and accepted baptism from them. It is probable that the Slavic Liturgy was at the same time promulgated in Croatia, as would appear from a papal brief issued when the Croats returned to their allegiance to him. (Schafarik, ii, 287.)

At this time all the mainland of Dalmatia was occupied by Slaves, and the citizens of the town were chiefly Romans, who also inhabited the islands off the coast. As the latter, however, were terribly harassed by pirates, no doubt Saracens, and were in danger of extermination, they appealed to the Croats to allow them to move to the mainland; but they refused permission, unless they paid tribute; upon which they appealed to the Emperor Basil, who ordered that they should pay the same tax to the Croats

which they had paid to the imperial prefect; and from this date, Aspalathus, *i.e.*, Spalato paid 200 gold pieces; Trogir, 100 gold pieces; Diodora (*i.e.*, Zader), 110 gold pieces; Opsara (Osero), 100 gold pieces; Arbe (Rab), 100 gold pieces; Becla (Wkła), 100 gold pieces. This was in addition to a certain tax on wine and other products. (Const. Porp.; Stritter, ii, 398-9.) In return apparently for this favour, the Croats and Servians sent a contingent to help the Greeks at Bari, in the year 888, when they were attacked by the Saracens. (Schafarik, ii, 287.)

In May, 879, Sdeslaf was killed by Branimir, who broke off the connection with the East, and placed the Croats once more under the ecclesiastical authority of Rome, and sent Theodosios, the "Diaconus" of Nin, to Rome to be consecrated a bishop.

John, Archpriest of Solina; Vitalis, Bishop of Zader; Dominicus, Bishop of Osero, and others who were referred to, did not wish to receive their authority from Rome, and it may be mentioned as a proof of the strength of the Eastern party, that Maximus, the new Archbishop of Spalato, was consecrated by Walpert, the delegate of Photius, Patriarch of Aquileia. And it was a long time before the Greek cult was completely driven out of Croatia.

During Branimir's reign, the Croats were independent, both of the Byzantines and the Franks. In 882, Branimir was succeeded by Mutimir or Muntimir, the younger son of Trpimir, who had defeated his elder brother Kryesimir. In a deed of his, dated in 892, we first meet with certain high dignitaries, as the Maccecharius (? Magnus Cococus* or chief cook), Cavelariius, Camerarius, Pinzenarius, Armiger. (Schafarik, ii, 288-9.) Muntimir must not be confused with the prince of the same name who was ruling at this time in Servia.

Muntimir was apparently succeeded by his elder brother Kryesimir, whose authority he had usurped. The latter was reigning in 900, and continued to rule till 914 (*id.*, 289), when he was succeeded by his son Miroslaf, who was killed three years later by the Croatian Ban Pribina. (Stritter, ii, 396.) He was not allowed to keep his ill-gotten throne long, for in 920 we find a prince named Tomislaf, who is known from a letter to the Pope John the Tenth. During his reign, and in the year 925, a synod was held at Spalato, where the use of the Slavic Liturgy was forbidden. At another synod in 928, three new Croatian bishoprics were founded at Skradin, Sisek, and Duwno. In 924, the Serbian prince Zacharias, with a great number of his people, sought shelter in Croatia from the attacks of the Bulgarians. These emigrants did not return home till ten years later. It was this close alliance of the two peoples,

* Or perhaps Claviger, from mediæval Greek Matsouka and low Latin Maxuga, mazuca, a key.

which probably led to the invasion of Croatia in 927 by Alogoboturs, the general of the Bulgarian king Simeon; an expedition which had an unfortunate end, the invaders being badly beaten. In 940, Godimir, or Chedomir, became the ruler of Croatia, and he was succeeded in 958, by his grandson Kryesimir the Second, called the Great, who restored his country to its ancient prosperity, which had much decayed during the recent revolutions. He was succeeded by his younger son Drzislaf. He was the *protégé* of the Greek Emperors Basil and Constantine, and as a consequence of the doubtless renewed prosperity of the country, we find him forsaking the ancient title of Veliki Zupan or Great Zupan, and adopting that of king, which was borne by his successors. According to the frail testimony of Thomas of Spalato, says Schafarik, he joined Neretwa and Zachlumen to his kingdom. On the other hand, we find that the coast towns of Dalmatia, Zader, Trogir and Spalato, and the islands of Kerk, Rab, and Kortschula, which had been for one hundred and twenty years tributary to the Croatians, were now conquered by Peter Urselus the Second, Doge of Venice, who styled himself Dux Dalmatiæ. (*Id.*, 291.)

Wilkinson, in reporting the results of this war, says, "The Croatians were also expelled from the Isle of Pago, which was restored to Zara, and Surigna was sent by his brother Mucimir (? Drzislaf of Schafarik) on a mission to the Doge at Trau, with instructions to make peace on any terms. A treaty was therefore concluded, by which the King of Croatia promised to abstain from all acts of aggression in Dalmatia, and sent his son Stephen to Venice as a hostage for his fidelity. He there received an education worthy of his rank, and afterwards married Nilcea, the daughter of the Doge. (*Op. cit.*, ii, 227.)

In the year 1000, Drzislaf was displaced by his elder brother Kryesimir the Third (the first as king). Catalinich says he was killed in an attempt to relieve the island of Pasmaus. (Wilkinson, *op. cit.*, ii, 226, Kryesimir.) He had been previously granted the title of Patrician by the Greek Emperor. He tried to drive the Venetians out of Dalmatia, but was defeated by them in 1013. Bulgaria and Servia had both submitted to the throne of Byzantium, and according to Zonaras and Cedrenus, their example was followed by that of the Croats. But Schafarik has shown that these writers have used the term Croat in a mistake for Serbian. (*Op. cit.*, ii, 291.) Kryesimir the Third was succeeded in 1035 by his son (? his nephew, Wilkinson, *op. cit.*, 227-8), Stephen the First, whose wealth is proved by the rich presents he made to the Church. By his second marriage with Wetenega, the widow of the Patrician Doym of Zader, he had two sons; one of whom who

succeeded him as Peter Kryesimir the Fourth (or second as king), was the most famous of all the Croatian rulers. Soon after his accession in 1050, he recovered the Dalmatian towns from the Venetians; the archbishop and city of Spalato, and the Bishop of Rab acknowledged him as their suzerain. He thereupon took the title of King of Dalmatia. In 1066 Zara was again wrested from him by the Doge Domenico Contarini. (*Id.*, ii, 229.) He introduced several ecclesiastical reforms. He planted new bishoprics at Belgrade on the coast, and at Knin; and his sister Cica founded the nunnery of Sta. Maria at Zara, of which she became the first abbess. The Bishop of Kief was nominated High Chancellor of the realm. His diocese reached as far as Drau. Under him a famous synod was held at Spalato, where the Slavic Liturgy was again prohibited. Methodeus was proclaimed as a heretic, and the Cyrellian writing was denounced as an invention of the Arian Goths. It was probably less from its Arian quality than from its having originated with the Greek Church that it was unpopular. Before his death, which happened in 1074, Stephen adopted his nephew Kryesimir as his successor; but this was not carried out, for the throne was seized by one named Slawisha, of whose history little is known. We read however that in November, 1075, he was captured and carried off as a prisoner to Apulia by the Norman chief Amikus. Wilkinson says the Normans were called in by the partisans of the dispossessed Stephen, who had retired to Spalato to the Benedictine convent of Saint Stephen. (*Op. cit.*, ii, 229.) The throne was then occupied by Demeter Zwonimir, who had been Ban of Croatia, and had married the daughter of St. Stephen of Hungary and sister of Vladislaf, but had been deposed by Slawisha. (Wilkinson, ii, 230; Schafarik, 292.) To strengthen his position, he, by the advice of the Archbishop Laurence of Solina, acknowledged the Pope as his suzerain, who thereupon sent him the emblems of the royal dignity, and he was duly crowned on the 9th of October, 1076, in the church of St. Peter at Old Solina. (*Id.*, 293.) But things were now going badly with the Croats. The Normans appeared in crowds on the coast, while the Venetians endeavoured to recover their lost authority on the Dalmatian shore. On Zwonimir's death in 1087, he was succeeded by Stephen the Second, the exiled nephew of Kryesimir the Fourth. He had taken refuge in a monastery, as I have said from which he now withdrew, and was duly crowned at Sebenico by the Archbishop on the 8th of September, 1089; but he died the following year, the last representation of the race of the Drzislafs. His death was followed by a terrible civil strife, in the midst of which one of the Zupans offered the crown to the brave Hungarian king

Vladislaf. Accepting the invitation, he marched with an army to Modrush, overran the country, and nominated his nephew Almus as its king. Later he founded the Bishopric of Agram (the Slavic Zagreb). On the death of Vladislaf, he was succeeded by Koloman, who seized upon Bielogorod (now called Zara Vecchia) (Wilkinson, 231, note), and apparently displaced Almus. The Zupan Peter thereupon rose in rebellion against him, and he in turn marched an army into Croatia. The Croats in the presence of this danger seem to have stopped their civil strife, and divided the land among twelve Zupans.

They collected their warriors, and awaited the attack of Koloman on the Drave. Not being certain of victory, the latter made proposals of peace, in which he engaged to protect their liberties. These overtures were successful, and peace was duly ratified, and the Croats acknowledged Koloman and the Hungarians as their masters; and he undertook to respect their rights, freedom, and laws. A Zupan (probably Peter is meant) who was discontented with this peace, was slain in a fight in the mountains of Gwozdansko; and Koloman was crowned at Biograd by the Archbishop Crescentius, of Spalato, with his bride Bussita, a daughter of the Norman Count Roger. (Wilkinson, ii, 231.) This was in 1102. Thenceforward Croatia was governed by a deputy of the Hungarian king, who was styled the Ban of Croatia, and the Hungarian kings took the title of kings of Croatia and Dalmatia. Some of the Dalmatian islands were seized by the Venetians, who after many bloody struggles, planted their authority also in several of the towns on the coast. (*Id.*, 294.) The story, and a very interesting one it is, of the fierce strife between Hungary and Venice for these Dalmatian towns, has been told in detail by Sir Gardner Wilkinson in the work already quoted (*op. cit.*, chapter ix, *passim*), but it forms no part of our present subject.

Modern Austrian Croatia is divided into two well marked sections: Provincial Croatia, comprising the three districts of Agram (Zagreb), Warasdin, and Kreutz, with the maritime district adjoining; and secondly, Military Croatia, until recently divided into two generals' commands, and comprising eight regiments. Besides these, to which alone the name of Croatia is now generally applied, there were comprised in ancient Croatia the northern part of the modern Dalmatia as far as the Zetina, the north-western part of Bosnia as far as the Urbas, and the modern Slavonia. In early times it also included Istria, and although the latter was detached from Croatia about the end of the eighth century, it still retains a Croatian dialect. Over all this district the Croats were the dominant race, and it was all known in early times as Croatia, and included, as I have

said, three well marked divisions, namely Pannonian Croatia, or Croatia on the Save, Provincial Croatia, and Dalmatia.

The eastern portion of ancient Croatia is now called Slavonia; and it is interesting to trace the history of this name. From the earliest times to the days of Matthias Corvinus (*i.e.*, 837–1492), the rulers of Croatia bore no other title than that of princes and kings of Croatia and Dalmatia. Foreigners, however, occasionally applied the generic name Slavi to them. Thus in a letter from the Emperor Louis the Second to the Emperor Basil, in 871, they are called Slavini, and their country Slavonia. In a brief of Pope John the Tenth, 914–29, to John the Fourteenth, Archbishop of Spalato, it is called Slavinatorum terra, Slavina terra, and in another brief of Innocent the Fourth, Slavonia terra. (Schafarik, *op. cit.*, ii, 307.)

During the reigns of Bela the Third, 1170–96, and Andrew the Second, 1205–35, the section of Croatia lying between the Drave and the Save was carved out into an appanage, and was called the Duchy of Slavonia (*ducatus Slavoniæ*). King Vladislaf probably suspicious against John Corvinus, who ruled the Duchy of Croatia, took in 1492 the title of King of Slavonia. After the battle of Mohacz, a portion of Slavonia was occupied by the Turks, and we then find the name Croatia limited to that portion of it comprising the districts of Agram, Warasdin, and Kreutz, which still remained subject to the Hungarians; while the other portion, which was occupied by the Turks, and was only recovered at a later day, namely, the districts of Veröcze, Posega, and Syrmia, received the name of Slavonia, which it still retains. (*Id.*)

All the Croats, except a section who occupy the north-western mountain district of Bosnia called Kraina, and often called Turkish Croatia, as far as the river Urbas, are now subject to Austria. Kraina was a part of the ancient Croatia, and was probably detached from it at the end of the fourteenth century, when Tuarko founded the kingdom of Bosnia, and appropriated considerable districts from his neighbours; and it fell apparently with the rest of Bosnia into Turkish hands.

The Croats were originally no doubt a homogeneous race, and hardly distinguishable from the Servians, of whom, in fact, they formed a section.

At present there are, however, two well-marked Croatian dialects; one prevails in Provincial Croatia and in the country of the St. George and the Kreutz or Cross Regiments, while the other prevails in the other districts of Croatia in the Litorale and in Slavonia. The latter apparently hardly differs from the dialect of the districts occupied by the Servians proper. The

former perhaps originated in a mixture of the invaders with the Slovenians of Carinthia, etc., otherwise known as Wends. (*Id.*, 308-309.)

As I have said, the Croats and the Servians were originally one race, speaking one language, and having one history. The great distinguishing feature which has made their history run in separate grooves, has been the fact of the former being Roman Catholics and the latter attached to the Greek Church. This has given an entirely different direction to the sympathies of the most potent social force in the country, namely, that of the priesthood. The Croats also being further removed from such dangerous neighbours, were not so sophisticated by Bulgarian or Turkish domination, and retained their practical independence, although subject to the Hungarian Crown.

But we must never forget that in origin and in race they belong to the great Servian stock, which will, we trust, occupy us in our next paper.

More CASTELLIERI. By RICHARD F. BURTON *and* MESSIEURS ANTONIO SCAMPICCHIO (LL.D.), *of* ALBONA, *and* ANTONIO COVAZ, *of* PISINO (Deputy to the Diet, etc.).

SECTION I.—THE SEABOARD OF ISTRIA.

I HAVE obtained the consent of Dr. Antonio Scampicchio, and associated his name with my own, in these pages, of which many are translated from his letters and notes. He has also at my especial request, been good enough to write out for me the rustic Slav songs common about Albona, of which short specimens conclude the next section, and to translate into Italian my first paper, "Notes on the Castellieri." I have also ventured to add to these pages the name of Sig. Antonio Covaz of Pisino, Deputy to the Istria Diet; most of the excursions in the southern peninsula were undertaken by his advice, and many of the most important details come from his practised pen.

The little Istrian peninsula, which still preserves its classical name Istria or Danube-land, and is shaped on the map like a greatly reduced Africa, as the poet says, is geographically distinct from the rest of the Austrian world.

To north, west, south and south-east, this Xth. Regio of old Rome is bounded by the Gulf of Trieste, by the Adriatic, and by the Quarner or Quarnero. Sinus Flanaticus (not Fanaticus) of which the Florentine Francesco Berlingeri says:—

THE
JOURNAL



OF THE
ANTHROPOLOGICAL INSTITUTE
OF
GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND.

VOL. VIII.

LONDON:
PUBLISHED FOR
The Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland,
BY
TRÜBNER & CO., 57 & 59, LUDGATE HILL.
All Rights Reserved.
1879.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
ALLEN, Mr. FRANCIS A. On the Original Range of the Papuan and Negritto Races	38
ATKINSON, Mr. G. M. On a Scale to Find Cranial Indices	279
BEDDOE, Dr. JOHN. On the Bulgarians	232
BLAKE, Dr. CARTER, Prof. OWEN, and Prof. BUSK. Notes and Observations on Skulls brought by Capt. R. F. BURTON from the East ..	319
BOSCAWEN, Mr. W. ST. CHAD. The Pre-Historic Civilisation of Babylonia.. .. .	21
BUCKLAND, Miss A. W. Ethnological Hints afforded by the Stimulants in use among Savages and among the Ancients	239
BURTON, Capt. R. F. Stones and Bones from Egypt and Midian ..	290
CUST, Mr. ROBERT. Report on Anthropological Proceedings at the Oriental Congress at Florence	285
DISTANT, Mr. W. L. Anthropological Gleanings	96
—— Anthropological Miscellanea	336
FLOWER, Prof. W. H. Illustrations of the Mode of Preserving the Dead in Darnley Island and in South Australia	389
FOX, Maj.-Gen. A. LANE. Observations on the Topography of Sigwell ..	191
GALTON, Mr. FRANCIS. Composite Portraits	132
HAAST, Dr. JULIUS VON. On Rock Paintings in New Zealand	50
HOWORTH, Mr. H. H. The Spread of the Slaves, Part II. The Southern Serbs, Bosnians, Montenegrins, and Herzegovinians	65
JONES, Hon. CHARLES C. Bird-Shaped Mounds in Putnam County, Georgia, U.S.	92
LAWES, Rev. W. G. Ethnological Notes on the Motu, Koitapu, and Koiari Tribes of New Guinea	369
LEWIS, Mr. A. L. On the Devil's Arrows, Yorkshire	180
—— On the Evils arising from the Use of Historical National Names as Scientific Terms	325
PASKE, Colonel EDWARD. On Buddhism in the British Provinces of Little Tibet	195

saw the natives use and which subsequent navigators have described. It seems either to be a native imitation of the first firearms seen, or else to have some symbolic meaning. Perhaps the numerous missionaries now located there could send us more details of Papuan customs. Otherwise, supposing the characters were Tamil, we might remember that gunpowder and firearms were mentioned as early as the Sacred Books of the Hindus. The custom of drinking (at a distance from the vessel) was common to both New Zealand and South India. Taylor, in his work upon New Zealand, called the bell discovered there Chinese or Japanese, and Van Diemen or Cook remarked a striking resemblance between the Maoris and Japanese.

Mr. MOGGRIDGE observed that one of the figures, No. 17, was the same as one which had been seen on rocks 6,900 feet above the sea in the N.W. corner of Italy. The inscriptions are not in colours as are those given in the paper, but are made by the repeated dots of a sharp pointed instrument. It is probable that if we knew how to read them they might convey important information, since the same signs occur in different combinations, just as the letters of our alphabet recur in different combinations to form words. Without the whole of these figures we cannot say whether the same probability applies to them.

The PRESIDENT, COLONEL GODWIN AUSTEN and MR. E. B. TYLOR offered some remarks.

THE SPREAD *of the* SLAVES. Part II.

THE SOUTHERN SERBS, BOSNIANS, MONTENEGRINS, *and* HERZEGOVINIANS.

By H. H. HOWORTH, Esq., F.S.A.

IN a previous paper we collected the evidence upon which it is now generally held that the Croats migrated about the year 634 from Gallicia and the Northern flanks of the Carpathians to their present situation at the head of the Adriatic, and also traced out their history till they lost their independence. We must now deal with their next neighbours, the Serbs. The Serbs and Croats are essentially the same race, sprung from the same stock and original homeland, and differentiated only by having separate histories. Croat, as we have shown, is a mere topographical name, derived from Khrebet (a mountain chain) and denoting the original country of the race, the Carpathians. It is a name without any ethnic value. Serb, on the other hand, according to the best Slave authorities, is essentially an ethnic name, and was apparently the generic name by which both

Serbs and Croats were originally known. Nay, further, Schafarik, whose authority I value very highly, deems Serb to be the original indigenous name by which the Slaves called themselves. He argues very forcibly that Jornandes, who was an Alan by birth, afterwards in the service of the Gothic king and eventually Gothic bishop of Ravenna, derived his information about the Slaves from Teutonic sources. He thus calls them generically Winidi or Wends, the name by which the Slaves are still known to the Germans, and he divides them into the two sections Antæ and Slavini. These two latter names do not occur before his time. According to Schafarik they were then probably new. It is not impossible that they were also of foreign origin.

While Jornandes probably derived his information from Teutonic sources, Procopius, who was a Greek, drew his account of the Slaves in all probability from the Slaves themselves. He says, "Both the Slavi and Antæ had formerly a common name and were called Sporoi, as I think, because they were Sporades, *i.e.*, living in scattered houses." This name Sporoi, the equivalent of the Winidi of Jornandes, Schafarik deems to be the oldest generic name of the Slaves extant. (*Op. cit.*, i, 92 and 93.)

This name of Sporoi, as the same author says, is not Slavic in form nor yet is it European, and he concludes with his very able predecessor, Dobrowski, that Sporoi is a corruption of Serbi.

In confirmation of this view he urges how in early times the name Serb is found applied to Slavic tribes in very remotely situated neighbourhoods, as in Upper and Lower Lusatia, on the Danube and the Save, north of the Carpathians and in Russia, and as further evidence of its indigenous character he names the fact that the tribe is cited by Pliny, who tells us that on the Kimmerian Bosphorus lived the Mæotici, the Vali, the Serbi, the Arrechi, the Zingi, and the Psesii, while Ptolemy tells us that between the Keraunian Mountains and the Rha (*i.e.*, the Volga) dwelt the Orynai, the Vali, and the Serbi. (Schafarik, i, 95-96.)

I confess that I am not at all convinced by this argument of Schafarik. Procopius was a singularly accurate historian. His value in this respect has received the especial notice of Gibbon, and it seems incredible to me that he should have given us such a corrupt form of the name Serbi as Sporoi, a form which is so entirely different in sound to the word Serbi. Again, as to the name being widely disseminated, it will be found to be explained, not by Serb having been a generic name applied to all the Slavic race, but by the fact, which we hope to prove, that the Serbs proper, migrated to very different areas from their original homeland. As to the mention of Serbi by Pliny and Ptolemy, I agree

with Zeuss, that the area named as their home and the tribes they are mentioned with prove that the Serbi of these authors were a different race altogether from the Slavic Serbs of later days, and Zeuss suggests they had as much to do with them perhaps as the Suevic Scythæ who lived on the Imaus according to Ptolemy had to do with Suevi of Germany. (Zeuss, 608, note.) Let us now examine the forms and etymology of the name; the former I shall extract from the elaborate account of Schafarik. Vibius Sequester calls them Servetii or Cervetii; Fredegar, Surbii; the chron. Moissiac. Siurbi; the Lorsch Annals Suurbi; Alfred the Great, Surpe and Surfe; Reginon and the Bavarian geographer Surbi; a Silesian Chronicle quoted by Sommerberg, speaks of a Surbiensis provincia; in a deed of 1136, we have Swurbelant; in Biterolf, Surben; in Eginhardt, the Fulda Annals, Adam of Bremen, Helmold, etc, Sorabi; by Peter Bibliothecar Soavi (for Soravi); by Kadlubek, Sarbiensis prov.; in a deed of 873, Sarowe prov.; in Boguchwal Sarb; in the glosses to the *Mater Verborum* of bishop Salomo, Sirbi; by Sigebert Gemblacensis, Sirbia; by the Emperor Constantine Porphyrogenitus, Serbli and Serbii, also Serbia (the modern town of Srbiça in Macedonia); in a deed of 949 Ciertvi (the town of Zerben); in the foundation charter of the Bishopric of Brandenburg, dated in 949, Ciervisti (referring to the Zupa or Gau of that name); in a deed of 975, Kirrusti; in Cod S. Meuric, Kiruiti; in another deed of 1003, Zerbiste; in Dithmar Merseb. Ziruiisti (the modern Zerbst the capital of the Gau); in a deed of 1147, Zeviriske; in others of 1161, Cervisti, of 1196 Cherevist, of 1197 Cherewist; in a deed of 961, Zurbici (now Zorbis in the district of Leipzig) by Dithmar Zurbizi and Çurbizi, by the Annalista Saxo Zurbike; in a deed of 1144, Zorbwech; in another deed, Sorbek. Dithmar and the Annalista Saxo mention a town Zribenz (now Schrenz). We have in a deed of 1040 mention made of the Gau of Zúrba; in a deed of 1060 a town of Serebez (now Sehrabiz). Cedrenus speaks of the Serbii; Zonaras, Anna Comnena, etc., of the Serbi. In a Munich MS. of the 11th century, we have Zeruiani (for Serbiani). In the glosses of the Bohemian Wacerad in 1102, Zirbi; in Cosmas, Zribia, Zribin. In Nestor in the MS. of 1377, Sereb and Serb. In Serbian documents of the 12th to the 14th century, Srb' Sr'b'l', Sr'bin, Sr'blin, Sr'bli (plur.), and Sr'bsky (adj.). In Dalimil Srbowe. The Southern Serbians still call themselves Srb, Sribin, Sriblin, Sribjak, while the northern ones of Lusatia are styled Serb, Serbjo (plur.), Serbski and Serski (adj.). In Russia and Poland we have numerous places compounded of the name, as Serebszczyzna, Sierbszczyzna, Serepczyzna, or Sierpczyzna, mentioned in a Lithuanian Statute of 1529, which is written Ser-

bowie and Serbia by Bielski in his chronicle of 1597, and Serbowie Serbin, Serby by Blazofsky in 1611. We find places called Serben and Serbigal in Liefland, Serbino in the Government of Saint Petersburg, Sierby in Minsk, Serbowski in Chernigof, Serbi and Serbinowka in Volhynia; these are in Russia. In Poland we have Serbentynie, Serbentyny or Serbentyszki in the voivodeship of Augustowo, Serbinof in Sandomir, Sierbowice in Krakau, and Sarbice, Sarbicko, Sarbiewo, Sarbin in the districts of Krakau, Plotsk and Kalisch in Western Galicia, etc. The Latin forms of the name, as is well known, were Servi and Serviani. (Schafarik, *op. cit.*, 175–177.) Schafarik is no doubt right in reducing all these various forms to the root Serb or Srb (*op. cit.*, i, 177 and 178), but when we come to attach a meaning to this root-word we are met with profound difficulties.

The Emperor Constantine has an etymology of his own; he speaks of “the Serbli, who in the Roman tongue are called Servi;” and adds “that from them the shoe of a slave was called Serbula, and that those were called Serbuliani whose shoes were of a rude and poor character.” He adds “they were called Servi since they *served* the Roman Emperor.” (Stritter, ii, 152 and 153.) Schafarik with considerable confidence connects the word with an old Slavonic root, Sir (orbus); in Russian, siryj, sirota; in Serbian, Croatian, Karinthian, and Slovak, sirota; Bohemian, sirotek, sirube, siroba; Lower Lusatian, sirota; in Upper Lusatian, syrota, Syrotstwo; Polish, sierota, sieroce, sieroci, words connected with the Sanscrit su (generare, producere) in Lat. sevi satum from se rere for se sere (se reduplicated); Gothic, saian; Scandinavian, soa (serere), etc., etc. (*Op. cit.*, 179.) This etymology seems to me to be exceedingly farfetched and improbable, and I cannot accept it for a moment. I much prefer to side with the learned and very critical Dobrowski who after a most searching inquiry among all the Slavic dialects could find no reasonable etymology of the word. (Dobrowski, *Inst. I, Slav*, p. 154; Schafarik, *op. cit.*, i, 174.)

This conclusion makes it a proper subject of inquiry whether the name be not a foreign one. Now in my various inquiries into Slavic history I have been very much struck by a fact which is its leading factor, namely, that the Slaves, *per se*, are a helpless, weak, childlike race, incapable of originating or of carrying out great innovations or great conquests. That the leaven which has ever leavened the various branches of the race has been of foreign importation, and that the leaders, the upper strata among them, who have alone shown energy and skill and enterprise have been foreigners and not natives. Thus in Russia the people who gave its name to Russia, and from whom the older dynasty and older aristocracy were descended, were the Scandi-

navians. In later times the Tartars and the Germans have been the salt of the community. The Bulgarians were led and governed by a caste of foreigners, the Turanian Bulgars, the Slovaks and other Slave races of Hungary by the various Turanian tribes who have occupied that area from early days. The Croats, as we have shown, were in close connection with the Avars who also conquered the Antæ.

This dependence on a more vigorous race of leaders has been well expressed by a recent correspondent of the *Standard* in one of a series of able letters in which he argues that the recent consolidating influence among the Russian Slaves has been its German element. Without it the race is as mobile as mercury.

This being the character of the race wherever we can test it, it would assuredly be an extraordinary fact if the Serbs who both to the north and south of the Carpathians were so vigorous in early days should have been an exception to the rule. I believe they were not so, but that like the Slaves of Bulgaria, they were led by a foreign race who supplied their upper class.

If we postulate this as more than probable, we may then connect them, as Schafarik has done, with the Serbi or Surbi of Pliny and Ptolemy; this tribe which from its habitat and from the names of the tribes with which it is linked, we may take to have been of Alanic or of Hunnic blood, was no doubt thrust westward in the various race migrations that took place in South-Eastern Europe from the 5th to the 7th century, and just as the Bulgars led a race of Slaves into Thrace so I believe the Serbi or Surbi overcame and led another branch of the same race southwards towards the Danube, and westwards towards the Elbe. In this view the Serbi or Surbi were not originally Slaves at all, but a conquering tribe who led a race of Slaves. This is my view of the origin of the name; let us now turn to the history of the race. In the present notice we shall limit ourselves entirely to the Southern Serbs, leaving their northern brothers to be treated in another paper. As in the case of the Croats, Constantine Porphyrogenitus is the author who first describes the migration of the Serbs. He tells us that after the migration of the Croats, who had been summoned, as I have mentioned in the previous paper, to his assistance by the Emperor Heraclius the Serbli also went to the same emperor. (Stritter, ii, 393.)

Schafarik, who has discussed the dates of this migration, concludes, I think very reasonably that, the Croats migrated in 634, and the Serbians in 636, (*op. cit.*, ii. 241.) They were sprung, says the emperor, from the unbaptized Serbians who were also called White, and dwelt beyond the Turks (*i.e.*, the Magyars), in a place called Boiki by them, which is not far from Francia, and also near to Great Croatia, which is also called White (Stritter, *op.*

cit., ii, 151.) He also tells us that this land of Boiki was watered by the Bislas or Ditzike. (Schafarik, ii, 239, and 243.) I have already in my former paper discussed Schafarik's very reasonable conclusions about Boiki showing that it did not mean Bohemia, but the land of the still surviving Ruthenian Boiki. (In the Ruthenian dialect Bojki, singular Bojok; Schafarik, ii, 243.) These Boiki live in Eastern Gallicia from the sources of the Dniester to the Pruth. In the districts of Sambor and Stryj in the lower parts of Stanislawof and Kolomyj and scattered about in Chorkof and even further north. (Schafarik, ii, 243.) I may add as a remarkable confirmation of the argument previously addressed that the Serbi were originally an Alanic or Hunnic tribe that Jornandes in enumerating the Hunnic tribes on the Maeotis mentions the Boisci which is assuredly another form of Boiki. It may be also remarked that the use of the term white as equivalent to great or free in the phrases White Serbia or White Croatia is essentially an Eastern expression in use very generally among the Turks, and other Turanian tribes.

The White Serbia of Constantine then is to be identified with Eastern Gallicia and Red Russia. This is largely confirmed by the fact that the language of the Southern Serbs and the Croats is closely related to the Ruthenian and White Russian. (Schafarik, ii, 245.) The topography of the two districts also strengthens the same conclusion; thus we have the Cetina a tributary of the Bug, and a Cetina in Dalmatia, San in Gallicia San in Carinthia and Sana in Bosnia, etc. etc. (*Id.* 246.) A number of words which in the Serbian and Croatian languages are like those in Lettish, Lithuanian, and Old Prussian show that they must formerly have been in close contact with the latter races. Thus: Illyrian, *dekla, dikla* (puella, ancilla) Lett, *dehkla* (dea virginalis); Serb *sukun-djed* (atavus), *Sukun-baba* (atavia), Lett, *sugga* (familia); Serb *kuça* (canis femina), Lett, *kuzza*; Serb, *dubok* (profundus), Lett, *dohbis* (cavus), Lith. *dubbus*; Serb, *klanac* (fauces montis, semita montis) Lith, *kalnas* (mons.); Serb, *gruwati* (percutere cum sonitu), Lith, *grauju* (durio, tono); Serb, *griza* (tormina), Lith, *grizzas*; Serb *wlat* (spica), Croat, *lat*, Lith. *waltis*.; Serb *lud* (fatuus), Lith, *letas*; Serb, *tek* (vixdum solum), Lett, *teck*; Serb, *kosa* (capilli) Lith, *kassa* (tress of hair); Serb, *kruska* (pirum), Lith, *krausze*; Serb, *krs* (adluvis), Illyr *krs* (rupes), Lith, *krasuzus* (præruptum ripæ); Serb *kucati* (pulsare), Lith, *kucus* (fustis); Serb, *lanac* (catena), Lith, *lencugas*; Serb, *wienkawati* (jungere connubio), Lith *wenczawoju*; Serb *razboj* (latrocinium), Lith, *razbojus*; Serb, *grabiti* (rapere), Lett, *grabbaht, grahbt*; Serb, *kukawica* (miser, misera), Lett, *skukkis* (puella misera); Serb, *cupati* (vellere) Lith, *czopti*, etc. etc. We also find such names as Prusna, Prusjen or Prusin, Prus-

ianos (in 1017 in Cedrenos) and Prusez a town of Bosnia, in the southern district which carry us north to the kingdom of Prussia on the Baltic. (*Id.* 245 and 247.)

Constantine tells us definitely that the land of the unbaptized Serbians was watered by the Bislas, which was also called Ditzike (Stritter ii, 406.) Bislas is clearly Wisla, the Slavic name of the Vistula. Schafarik suggests that Ditzike if not a corruption of Dikitse or Tykitsch was probably the name of some tributary of the Vistula, Bug, or Niemen, whose name has been mistaken by Constantine for a synonym of the Vistula (*op. cit.*, ii, 248.) All these facts converge to one conclusion, namely, that the homeland of the Serbs before their migration southwards was in Eastern Gallicia and its neighbourhood. We shall probably have more to say of it when we come to deal with the Northern Serbs.

Constantine Porphyrogenitus tells us that on the death of one of their princes, the younger of two of his sons who divided his heritage led his people southwards, and asked the Emperor Heraclius for land to settle in. He granted them a district in the government of Thessaly which was afterwards called Serbia, but before long they grew discontented and asked the emperor's permission to return to their old land. (Stritter, ii, 151-2). The name of the town Serbitza on the Haliakmon, about nine leagues from Thessalonica, seems to show that some of them remained behind in Macedonia. (*Id.* ii, 239, note.) On crossing the Danube they regretted the step they had taken and longed for fresh settlements. They again approached the emperor through the Byzantine governor of Asprokastron or Belgrade. "He accordingly granted them," says Constantine, "the district now called Serbia and Paganía which was known as the country of the Zachlumi, Terwunia and the district of the Canalitæ, which were subject to the emperor, but which had been laid waste by the Avars who had driven the Roman inhabitants out and forced them to seek shelter in Dalmatia and Dyrrachium." That is, he granted them the country watered by the Drina, the Bosna and the Urbas, and bordering on that occupied by the Croats. The Avars were driven out and the Serbs settled down on the three rivers just named and extended themselves to the Adriatic. This second migration, the first having been probably in 636, took place in the year 638. (Schafarik, ii, 241.)

The country thus occupied by the Serbs was eventually divided into seven districts or *gaus*, *i.e.*, Serbia Proper (still so called); Bosnia, Neretwa, Zakh'luma, Terwunia, Kanalia and Dukla or Doklea, (*id.* 249). Each of these districts was governed by a Zupan. Of these the Serbian Zupan was the chief. He had his capital at Desnitza (Destinika of Constantine) on the Drina. The grand Zupan was, according to the Serbian

and old Slave custom, styled Starjesina (senior), and had authority over all the other Serbs, except the Neretshani or Pagani, who were entirely free and uncontrolled (*id.* 249). The Emperor Heraclius sent for priests from Rome, who introduced Christianity among the new settlers as they had among the Croats, but they do not seem to have had much success among the Serbs, who, to a great extent, remained attached to their old faith, and on the death of Heraclius in 641, fell completely away from their dependence on Byzantium. Constantine says nothing of the successors of the first prince, except that he was succeeded by his son and grandson. (Stritter ii, 153.) After some time reigned their descendant Boiseshtlabus, or Wyscheslaf, who lived about 780 (?) A.D. (Schafarik, ii, 250.) Then followed in turn Radoslaf, Prosigoi and Wlastimir. We do not know the name of the Serbian ruler to whom the Croatian prince Liudewit fled in 822, as Eginhardt tells us, and who was treacherously killed by him.

Wlastimir's reign fell between 836 and 843. Hitherto the Serbs and Bulgarians had lived at peace, but we are told he repelled the attack of the Bulgarian prince Presia, who waged a war of three years against him without other result than losing many men. He married his daughter to Kraian, the son of Belof the Zupan of Terwunia, and also conferred on him the title of prince, and released him from his suzerainty, a prerogative which was inherited by his sons Khwalimir and Zuzimir. (*Id.*)

Wlastimir's heritage was divided among his three sons Muntimir, Strojuni, and Gojnik. They had an important struggle with the Bulgarian King Michel Boris, the son of the Presia above-named, who wished to revenge his father's defeat, but he was himself beaten, and his son Wladimir was captured together with twelve war engines. (Schafarik ii, 176 and 177, and 250, Stritter ii, 155). This defeat led to peace being made between the two powers, and we are told the Serbian princes accompanied Boris on his return home as far as Rasa, which was on the Bulgarian frontier, from which statement, and also from the report of the envoys sent by the Constantinople Synod in 869, it would appear that the ancient Dardania lay within Bulgaria.*

A mention in contemporary narratives of a Bulgarian Morawa, and the statement that in 885 there was a Bulgarian governor at Belgrade, shows that the valley of the Serbian Morawa and of the Ibor, or so-called Lower Morawa, were in Boris' time subject to Bulgaria (Schafarik, ii, 177).

* Dardania was the district where the Morawa and the Ibor sprang and extended from Prishtina as far as Nisch.

We will not trace the history of Serbia any further in detail, nor relate its many struggles with the Bulgarians, with the Greek empire, with Hungary and the Dalmatian towns, nor shew how its alliances and its sympathies were at length ruled by its attachment to the Greek Church, which only secured its prize after a long struggle with the Latins. The capital of Serbia in early times was Dioklea, in later times Rasa, now called Novi Bazar. We will pass over the long interval between the 9th and the 14th century and turn to the days of the Great Serbian hero, Stephen Dushan.

Stephen Dushan was crowned King of Serbia on the 8th of September, 1331. At this time there had been considerable confusion in Bulgaria, but matters were at length tolerably settled by the elevation of John Alexander, the nephew of the former King Michael, to the throne. Alexander was the son-in-law of Ivanko Besseraba the Prince of Roumania, and he married his sister Helena to Stephen Dushan. The three rulers of Serbia, Bulgaria, and Roumania, now made a common alliance against the Greeks and Hungarians. (Jirecek, *Gesh. Bulg.*, 297–299.) Besseraba defeated the Hungarians, and Alexander fought successfully against the Greeks, but Stephen Dushan's victories were the most important. In the first three years of his reign he conquered Ochrida, Prilep (where he built himself a palace), Kastoria, Strumiça, Khlerin (now Lerin or Florina) Zeleznec (the Turkish Demirhissar north of Prespa), Voden, and all Western Macedonia. (*Id.* 299). At this time there was terrible confusion in Albania, whence the mountaineers had issued and ravaged the neighbouring districts in various directions. In 1336 Dushan invaded Northern Albania, and speedily appropriated the whole country except Durazzo.

Meanwhile, the condition of the Byzantine empire was rapidly becoming desperate, attacked as it was on the one side by the Slavs and on the other by the Turks, while its forces were paralysed by internal dissensions,

Andronicus the Third died in 1341, and left the throne to his son John, the Fifth, Palaeologos, against whom the ambitious John Kantakuzenos rose in rebellion, and planted his seat of empire at Didymotilchon on the Maritza. This feud was the signal for the Slaves to attack the empire. Alexander and his Bulgarians made a savage raid upon Thrace. We now find Kantakuzenos allying himself with Alexander of Bulgaria and with Stephen Dushan, and we are told that 24 Serbian voivodes accompanied him in his attempt to secure the Greek throne (Ranke's *Serbia*, 14). The Serbs and Greeks were naturally drawn together by their common faith, and had a common ground of opposition to the Latins; and while Kantakuzenos

conquered Thrace, Stephen Dushan appropriated Macedonia, where many of the inhabitants were of Serbian descent. The Byzantine authors compare him at one time to a fiercely raging fire, at another to a swollen torrent overflowing far and wide. (*Id.*, 15). He now, *i.e.*, in 1346, had himself crowned Tzar of the Serbs and Greeks at Skopia, and gave his son Urosh the title of kral or king, while with the consent of the patriarchs of Tirnova and Okhrida, he made the Archbishop Johanniki Patriarch of Serbia (Jirecek, 304). On another side Dushan defeated Louis the First of Hungary, and seems for a while to have occupied Belgrade and rescued Bosnia from an obstinate ban (Ranke, *op. cit.*, 15 and 16).

In 1347 Stephen Dushan was received with great honours at Ragusa, while Arta and Joannina were in his possession, and thence his voivodes spread themselves over all Roumelia on the Wardar and Marizza as far as Bulgaria. (Ranke, 16.) His reign was in fact the apogee of Serbian prosperity. His dominions reached from Arta to Belgrade and from the Dalmatian Mountains to the Mesta. In Macedonia the Byzantines only retained Thessalonica and he is proudly styled the Tzar of the Serbs and Greeks, of the Bulgarians and Albanians. Trade flourished greatly at Skopia, Novo Brdo, Prizren, and Kattaro where the Venetians, Ragusans, and Saxons planted factories and shops, and in 1349 he issued a famous code of laws to govern his subjects. (Jirecek, 305.) Alexander of Bulgaria was dependent on him, and his brother was Dushan's Governor of Albania. We need not wonder when we survey this picture that the Serbs look back to the days of Stephen Dushan as their golden age, but in the light of contemporary history we cannot forget one important fact which has been noted by a traveller in Serbia, who thus expresses himself: "The brilliant victories of Stephen Dushan were a misfortune to Christendom. They shattered the Greek Empire, the last feeble bulwark of Europe, and paved the way for those ultimate successes of the Asiatic conquerors, which a timely union of strength might have prevented." (Servia, by Paton, 222.) Dushan was about to invade Thrace with 80,000 men, with the intention of conquering Constantinople, when he suddenly died on the 20th of December, 1355, and with him passed away the glory of Serbia. His son, Urosh, was only 19 years old, while Simeon, Dushan's brother, and Helena, his widow, struggled for supreme power, and the pernicious aristocracy of the voivodes, which has been a terrible scourge to Slavonic communities, as may be seen in the history of Poland, broke out into open revolt and divided Roumelia into a number of petty states, probably only nominally dependent on Urosh, and they submitted them-

selves presently to the Osmanli, whose opportunity was created by these selfish quarrels. Urosh was murdered in 1368 by one of these feudal chiefs, namely, Vukashin, kral of Pheres. He was succeeded by Lazarus, a natural son of Stephen Dushan, who was styled merely kniaz Lazar. He was a pious and generous prince, and a brave but unsuccessful general. (Paton, *op. cit.*, 222.)

The Turkish system of occupying conquered countries with military colonies and carrying off the original inhabitants, says Ranke, excited a great national opposition in the year 1389, and a league was formed of the Serbians, Bosnians (who had regained their independence), and Albanians. The united troops were commanded by Lazar and Wuk Brankovitch, who had however been gained over by the Turks. Before the battle Milosh, the son-in-law of Lazar, entered the tent of Amurath, the Turkish sultan, and assassinated him. The fight took place on the following day on the famous field of Kossowa, in which Lazar was killed and Serbia was laid prostrate. It was fought on the 15th of June, 1389. Amurath's successor, Bajazet, nominated Stephen the son of Lazar, whose sister he married, king or despot of Serbia, and the latter served the Turks faithfully during his life. On his death he was succeeded by George, the son of Wuk, who was deposed by the Turks, in 1458, and Serbia was incorporated with the empire; nor was this altogether unwillingly. I have mentioned that the Serbs were strongly attached to the Greek faith, of which Stephen Dushan was a great champion, one of his laws ordaining that whoever endeavoured to pervert anyone to the Latin heresy was to be sent to work in the mines. This jealousy of Greek and Latin raised a great barrier to any common action between the Serbs and their northern neighbours, the Germans and Hungarians. A Serbian song, says Ranke, relates that George Brankovitch once inquired of John Hunyad what he intended to do with regard to religion, should he prove victorious. Hunyad did not deny that in such an event he would make the country Roman Catholic. Brankovitch thereupon addressed the same question to the Sultan; who answered that he would build a church near every mosque and would leave the people at liberty to bow in the mosques, or to cross themselves in the churches according to their respective creeds. The general opinion was that it was better to submit to the Turks, and retain their ancient faith than to accept the Latin rites The Serbians themselves invited the Osmanlis into their fortresses, that they might not see their strongholds given over to a Cardinal of the Romish Church. (*Op. cit.*, 29.) The Serbians did in fact what the Bosnian Paterenes did, namely, called in the Turks rather than surrender

their ties to their Church. But there was this difference:—in Bosnia and a large part of the Herzegovina the landowners adopted Islamism and retained their lands. In Serbia it was not so. The ancient noble class almost disappeared, the family of the Brankovitch's however retained till the beginning of the 17th century, their castle and possessions at Semendria. (Paton, 290.) The Kara Panshitshis kept their hold upon the Kraina while Starewala, and Klintsh also had their kniases or princes. The country was divided out among the Turkish Spahis, who had full authority both over the persons and the property of the Serbian peasants. (Ranke, 22.) Such at least of them as remained, for the Turkish conquest led to a migration of 37,000 Serbian families into Hungary. (Paton, *op. cit.*, 291.) The Serbians aided the Emperor Leopold greatly in his Turkish wars, and their brothers beyond the Save rose in rebellion to assist him. By the peace of Passarowitz a large portion of Serbia fell into the hands of the emperor. It was, however, recovered by the Turks, who wreaked their vengeance on the families of the rebels. They abolished the national Serbian hierarchy, and the Serbian bishop became subject to the Patriarch of Constantinople. The Turkish Spahis, as I have said, were the owners of the land, and the native Serbians became merely rayahs or cultivators who had to pay the Spahis rent. This was in fact a kind of hereditary stipend in return for which they rendered military services. The Spahis, according to Ranke, although not belonging to the ancient nobility, were mostly of Serbian extraction and language. (*Op. cit.*, 51.) They differed from the rayahs chiefly in belonging to another faith. They lived in the towns, while the rayahs occupied the open country. I shall not relate the story of the emancipation of the Serbs in detail. How it was brought about by the turbulence and tyranny of the Janissaries, whose leaders styled themselves deys or dahis, like the rulers of Barbary and Tripoli, and who lorded it over both the Spahis and the rayahs. How they succeeded in appropriating the land of the former and compelling them to migrate, and how eventually, when the Janissaries were extinguished, the rayahs themselves rose in rebellion and won their practical independence, exchanging the direct rule of the Sultan for the payment of an annual subsidy, and buying out the claims of their former masters, the Spahis. I would mention, however, as a fact equally interesting to the ethnologist and the historian that Serbia is essentially a peasant community. It was the peasants who won its independence, and it is the descendants of peasants who control its affairs now. This absence of a class or caste of leaders, who by the fact of belonging to a superior race and of inheriting wealth and traditions, is

generally found to be the guardian of chivalry, patriotism and the other unselfish public virtues may account for much in the later history of Servia which is not heroic and for the absence of what Ranke deplures—a more elevated tone of morality.

I will now pass on to consider the Serbs of Macedonia. As has been shown by Falmerayer and others, Greece was overrun and conquered by the Slavonians and Avars in the beginning of the 6th century. The Serbs who were called in to his assistance by Heraclius, first advanced, as I have shown, into Macedonia, where they would find, no doubt, considerable settlements of their countrymen. When they retired they left a small colony behind them which gave its name to Serbitza in Macedonia. Bohucz, the learned archbishop of Mohilef, in his "*Histoire des Sarmates*" would make out that the Slavonian element in Macedonia and the Morea is derived from this source. (*Op. cit.*, i, 115-117.) This view I cannot accept. These Macedonian Slaves are in the main no doubt descended from the earlier colony. It was probably not till the 14th century that any considerable body of Serbs migrated into Macedonia. During the reigns of Milutin, Stephen Urosh the Third, and Dushan, a Serbian named Khrelia, filled the post of Protosevast, and ruled the conquests they had made in Macedonia. He at length rebelled with a force of 1,000 men, and set up as an independent prince, ruling over three towns, with his residence at Strumiça, and the title of Cæsar Khrelia. He died in 1343. (Jirecek, *op. cit.*, 301.) His principality was annexed by Stephen Dushan.

On the latter's death, as I have mentioned, his possessions in Macedonia broke up into a number of small principalities. His brother, Simeon Palæologos Urosh, the ruler of Thessaly, Epirus, and Aetolia, was crowned at Trikala emperor of the Serbs and Greeks. He died in 1371, and left Epirus to Thomas, the son of the voivode Preliub, who ruled till 1385 and had a chronic struggle with the Albanians.

In Thessaly Simeon was succeeded by his son Johannes Urosh, the last of the stock of Nemanya, a famous ancestor of Stephen Dushan, who on the invasion of the Turks in 1410 became a bishop and the founder of the Meteor Monastery. (*Id.*, 319.)

The rest of the southern conquests of Dushan and his predecessors were divided into several small principalities. Thus Seres and Melnik fell to the brave despot Joannes Uglyesa. His brother Ulkasin first, *i.e.*, in 1356, filled the post of Selnik at the court of Dushan's son, Urosh, but he afterwards also took the title of despot. Uglyesa's father-in-law set up authority at Drama, while in South Macedonia, from Seres to Vardar, Bogdan, who is still remembered in the ballads of the country, became

chief. North of him was the Sebastocrator Deyan. Albania was divided between two Albanians, Andreas Musaki and Karl Thopia, the latter ruling the countries between the rivers Mat and Skumbi. North of them was the Slav Alexander, Gospodin of Valona and Kanina. Othrida fell to the Albanian Zupan Ropa or Gropa. Radoslaf Khlapen, Musaki's son-in-law, had the Macedonian Berrhoea. Zetla and the land round the Gulf of Scutari, *i.e.*, the modern Montenegro, obeyed the family of Balsa (*vide infra*). Herzegovina fell to Voislaf Voikhnovic, who was driven away by his nephew Nikola Altomanovic. The famous family of the Brankovitches trace their descent from the Sebastocrator Branko, who under Dushan was governor of Okhrida. (*Id.*) These various petty principalities had only an ephemeral existence, and were speedily overwhelmed by the Turks.

Let us now turn for a while to the fragment of the Serbian kingdom which survived in the Black Mountains.

After the terrible battle of Kossowa, where King Lazarus was killed, Prince George Balsha who had married the Despina, a daughter of the Serbian king, became independent in the old Zupa of Zenta, whose black mountains gave it its Italian name of Montenegro and made it also a suitable asylum for the fragment of the Serbian power, which survived. Stratzimir, the son of Balsha, was called Tzeruoie (*i.e.*, black) from his dark complexion, and he gave his name to the family of Tzeruoievitch. Their son Stephen Tzeruoievitch was a contemporary of the Albanian hero Skanderbeg, whom he aided by sending him a contingent of Serbians under his second son Bozidar (*i.e.*, divine gift).

Stephen left three sons, Ivan, Bozidar, and Andrew. On Scanderbeg's death in 1467, the Turks conquered Albania and the Herzegovina, and then turned upon Zenta. Ivan appealed to Venice in vain, and then abandoning his capital Zabilak (on the Moracsa now in Albania) to the Turks, he retired into the mountains, and in 1485 founded the convent of Cettinje, where he fixed his capital. Ivan was succeeded by his son George, who was a patron of learning, and introduced a printing press into the country, where many books of the Church service were printed. They are the oldest in the Cyrillic character, dating as early as 1494. He married a Venetian lady of the family of Moncenigo, by whom he had no children, and who persuaded him to retire to Venice. This he did with the consent of the people, and resigned his authority into the hands of the spiritual chiefs. The metropolitan Germen thereupon undertook the direction of affairs, introduced the present Theocratic form of government, and became the first Vladika.

The Turks succeeded in gaining over many of the people to

Islam during the next century, and Montenegro was treated as a portion of the Pashalic of Scutari, but they could not conquer the country, although they ravaged the valley of Bielopavlich with an army of 30,000 men. In 1623, Suleiman, Pasha of Scutari, penetrated as far as Cettinje, where he destroyed the convent, but he was compelled to retire with heavy losses.

Towards the end of the 17th century, Daniel Petrovich-Negosh was elected Vladika, and from that time the episcopal dignity has continued in the Petrovich family.

I shall not trace the history of Montenegro further in detail. The story has been well told by Wilkinson (Dalmatia and Montenegro). It will suffice to say that that history is a singularly heroic one, and that probably no community of modern times so well represents the virtues and prowess of ancient Sparta as that which lives in the Black Mountains. Time after time the Turks have invaded the land and devastated it with fire and sword, burnt its capital, Cettinje, and almost depopulated large districts, but it has never been conquered, and has earned the right to become the future hope of the South Slavonians. Its government until lately was a singularly patriarchal one. The popular diet meeting in the open air was the deliberative body, while the Vladika was at once high-priest, judge, legislator, commander-in-chief, and civil governor (Wilkinson, *op. cit.*, i, 460.) He was the only remaining instance, says Wilkinson, of the military bishops who played such an important part in the wars of the Middle Ages, nor was he inferior to those of former days in courage and prowess. For a long time the office of governor was held by a distinct person, and had become hereditary in the family of Radomit, but it became almost nominal, and was at length suppressed.

The language of Montenegro, says Wilkinson, is a very pure dialect of Slavonian. The Montenegrins themselves call it a Serbian dialect, which it no doubt is; and Krasinski says it is considered the nearest of all the Slavonian dialects to the old Slave tongue into which the Scriptures were translated by St. Cyril and Methodius in the 9th century. The dialect of the Maritime Serbs to the north is a good deal corrupted with Italian words, while that of Bosnia has been similarly sophisticated by Turkish. (Wilkinson, *op. cit.*, i, 450.)

The Montenegrins have generally good foreheads, but the face is not well shaped, being rather square (which is particularly observable in the women) with rather high cheekbones, and the lower jaw projecting a little at the side. Many are nevertheless very handsome. Their eyes are rather near than far apart, mostly hazel, and some few light blue. The hair is brown, sometimes dark, but rarely black. The profile of

the men has generally a decided outline, with a moderate aquiline or straight nose. In stature they are much above middle height, some are very tall and they are well proportioned. Their voices are powerful and they can converse at long distances (*id.* i, 450 and 451.) The moral and physical qualities which distinguish them so clearly from the other Southern Slaves, seem to point to their blood not being so unmixed as their language. They have apparently married considerably with the Albanians to the south. Their dress is nearly the same as that of the Albanians, whom they also resemble in wearing the fez and turban, and having a long lock of hair projecting behind; also in the absence of beards (*id.* 452 and 453).

Let us now turn to another part of the ancient Serbia, which has a tolerably substantive history, namely, Bosnia.

In the time of Constantine it formed a district of Serbia Proper, but it would seem that it had even then its own Zupan who was dependent on the Grand Zupan. Bosnia took its name from the river Bosna, a tributary of the Save which waters it. Constantine mentions two towns within its borders, namely, Katera, the modern Kotorsko or Kortoritza on the river Bosna and Desnik, probably the modern Desan or Tesan on a small tributary of the same river (Schafarik, ii, 261.) Although it is probable there was a separate Zupan of Bosnia from early times, the first time a Bosnian Zupan is named is in the year 1080. (*Id.* 256.) It would seem that in the early days of Croatian prosperity, the Croats appropriated a part or the whole of Bosnia, and according to Mr. Evans, when the King of Croatia died childless, a new king was elected by the seven Bans of the crown lands, one of whom was the Ban of Bosnia. The seven are enumerated in a deed of the year 1100 (Through Bosnia &c, xxvi) Bela Urosh (1120–1136) granted it to Ladislaf, the son of his daughter Helena, and he held it for some time as the Ducatus Bosnensis under the authority of the Hungarians who had conquered Croatia. The Magyars called Bosnia Rama, from the river of that name flowing into the Narenta (Evans, *op. cit.*, xxvii, Schafarik, ii, 257). In 1141 Geza the Second of Hungary completed the conquest of Bosnia, but its position remained more or less independent, and the Byzantine Chronicler Kinnamos, in describing his master Manoel's campaign against the Magyars, tells us the Drina divided Bosnia from the rest of Serbia. Bosnia was not then subject to the Grand Zupan of Serbia, but the people were at that time under their own magistrates and used their own customs (Stritter, ii, 177). Mr. Evans, in his learned and most valuable book, "A Walk through Bosnia and Montenegro," has written the history of Bosnia in detail, and has explained what a powerful element the Paterenes or Bogomils

(the Manichæan sectaries of its isolated districts) were in its various internal revolutions, and what a struggle its brave people and their ban had against the aggressive Roman Catholics of Hungary who threatened to overwhelm them. For the story of the contest I must refer to his pages, and will give only the concluding episodes. In 1444, Stephen Thomas was crowned king of Bosnia. He proved an uncompromising Roman Catholic, and the Inquisition was soon busy persecuting the Paterenes who were protected by Stephen Cossaccia the Duke of St. Saba, or Herzegovina and the chief dependent of the Bosnian crown. The Manichæan Paterenes in their distress turned, as their brothers had turned in Serbia, to the Turks, and invited them to come in. Thus was enacted another part in that fierce drama where Christians hated one another so cordially that they turned eagerly to the infidel to rid them of their rivals. Stephen Thomas, we are told, purchased an ignominious peace at the price of a tribute of 24,000 ducats a year. He afterwards, when the weight of the Turkish heel became intolerable, implored the assistance of the Western Powers, of the Pope, the King of Arragon, the Duke of Venice, the Duke of Burgundy, etc. (*Id.* Evans, lxxiii.) But the days for crusading were gone by; "already," says Mr. Evans, "in 1449, the Turks were settled in the country between the Drina and the Ukrina, and the neighbouring Pashas and Agas began to trade in Bosnian slaves." (*Id.*) At length his people grew weary of their impotent king, and Stephen Thomas was assassinated, "if report speaks truly by, his step-brother Radivoj and his illegitimate son Stephen." He, like his father, was an uncompromising Roman Catholic, and drove 40,000 Paterenes from the country. But there still remained behind a preponderating number of these sturdy sectaries, who "by the mouth of their spiritual chiefs, negotiated the transfer of their allegiance to the Sultan, and he agreed to allow them free toleration in religious matters, freedom from taxation, and other privileges." (*Id.* lxxvii.) In 1463, the Sultan Muhammed entered the country with a large force, and appeared before Bobovac, the ancient seat of the Bosnian bans and kings. Its governor was a Paterene and opened the gates of the city. The king fled first to Jaycze and then to Clissa on the coast of Primoria, where after a siege of forty days he surrendered. (*Id.* lxxviii.) The other towns of Bosnia speedily gave in, and we are told that in eight days seventy cities opened their gates to the Turks. The latter now put Stephen Tomasevic to death, "the most eminent nobles who had not fled to Dalmatia, were transported to Asia; 30,000 of the picked youth of Bosnia were taken to recruit the janissaries; and 200,000 of the inhabitants were sold as slaves."

(*Id.*) The Hungarians shortly after this succeeded in recovering a part of Bosnia, but they had to surrender it again, and in 1527, the whole country, as far as the Save, passed finally under the domination of the Turks. (*Id.*, lxxxvii.) The change was not an unwelcome one to the peoples, for "the rule of the Moslem was looked upon as less oppressive than that of the petty Christian bans and barons." (*Id.*) The Turks now offered to allow all those who would abjure their religion and accept Islam to retain their lands. The Paterenes seem to have accepted these terms almost universally, and as Mr. Evans says, we may perhaps suspect that the Manichæism which looked on Christ as one *Æon* might accept Muhammed as another. (*Id.* lxxxix). Thus came about the strange revolution by which a Slavic race became uncompromising Muhammedans, for as is very familiar to all students, the amount of Turkish blood in Bosnia and the Herzegovina is very slight indeed, and confined, as Mr. Evans says, to a few officials and a part of the soldiery. The Muhammedans there are of the same race precisely as the Christians, speak the same Serbian dialect, and trace back their title-deeds as far. (*Id.* xci.) They form a third of the population. The other two-thirds are divided in allegiance between the Greek and Latin Churches. The former have been largely recruited by immigrants from Serbia, while the latter have correspondingly decreased by emigration into Dalmatia, Croatia, and Slavonia. The landowning class, the gentry, and those who have the skill and the traditions of government are, as I have said, Muhammedans. A feudal aristocracy, "till within the last few years they were still living in the castles built by their Christian ancestors, they kept their old escutcheons, their Slavonic family names, their rolls and patents of nobility inherited from Christian kings. They led forth their retainers as of old under their baronial banners, and continued to indulge in the chivalrous pastime of hawking. The common people, on the other hand, have clung to their old Slavonic institutions, their sworn brotherhoods, their village communities, their house fathers; and have paid and pay still, the same feudal dues to their Muhammedan lords as they did to their Christian ancestors." (*Id.* xcii.)

Having traced out cursorily the history of Bosnia, let us turn for a short space to that of its old dependency, Herzegovina.

The Herzegovina formed the ancient Zupa of Zachluma, which was incorporated with Bosnia by the Ban Stephen in 1326. It was granted as a fief to a brave general of Stephen's named Vlatko Hranic who having transferred his allegiance to the Emperor Frederick the Fourth, was in 1440 given the style of duke (*Herzog*) whence his country got the name of Herzegovina which is merely the adjectival form of *Herzega*, the

Slavic corruption of Herzog. It includes the maritime districts of Serbia from Ragusa to the Cettina, to which were afterwards added Castelnovo, Hisaur and other places on the Gulf of Cattaro. Its capital was Mostar. I shall not tell its story, which is closely twined with that of Bosnia, in detail, but, as before, merely relate its concluding incidents. In 1466 died Stephen Cosaccia, the duke of Herzegovina, and his heritage was shared by his sons Ladislaf and Vlatko. In 1483 the Beglerbeg of Bosnia invaded the duchy, expelled the two princes, and incorporated their dominions in the Sandjakat of Bosnia (Wilkinson, *op. cit.*, ii, 96 and 97.) Stephen's son Stephen, who had been sent as a hostage to the Porte, became a renegade, took the name of Ahmed Pasha and rose to be Grand Vizier. He is known to the Turks as Herzekoglu, *i.e.*, the Duke's son, (Evans, lxxxi.) The Venetians after many struggles, conquered the coast district of Primoria and by the peace of Carlovitz in 1699, the Herzegovinian towns of Citluk, Gabella, Cattaro, Castelnovo and Risano with Knin, and Zeng and other places were left in the hands of the Venetians, the only remaining strips of Herzegovinian coastland left to the Turks being the narrow enclaves of Klek and Sutorina (*Id.* lxxxi, 1, note 2.) From the Venetians, who held sway here so long, they passed to the house of Austria, and we find in this ancient possession an explanation of the longing eyes which Italians are supposed to be now casting across the Adriatic. The inland districts of Herzegovina remain Turkish to this day. The condition of things socially in Herzegovina is very much the same as in Bosnia, except that the Muhammedan aristocracy is not relatively so numerous.

We have now traced the crooked history of the various fragments of the Serbian stock, and will conclude with some details about the topography of the Serbian land chiefly taken from the work of Schafarik. I have mentioned that the emperor Constantine tells us Serbia was divided into seven districts or zupas; one of them was distinctively known as Serbia.

The frontiers of Serbia properly so called were, according to the emperor Constantine, as follows: the Save bounded it on the north, on the west the mountain chain dividing the valleys of the Bosna and the Urbas and further north the chain between the Urbas and the Rama; thence the boundary continued through the Duwnanian plains as far as the Imota Lake, and thence to the mouth of the Zetina. In the south-west the Serbian islands were washed by the Adriatic; in the south-east Serbia was bounded by the mountains which stretch from Antivari (Bar) to the Lake of Scutari and from the River Drimez to the Plawno Lake; the Ibar and the Morawa apparently separated the Serbs

from the Bulgarians. It would seem that the land east of the Ibar on the Topliza on the Blue Morawa and the Tempeschka (*i.e.*, the ancient Dardania), was first colonized by the Bulgarians and only became attached to the Serbian kingdom in the time of Stephen Nemanya and his successors, and thus it came about that the Serbian dialect afterwards prevailed there. (Schafarik, ii, 258 and 259.)

The Serbian land proper was in later times divided into two districts, namely Serbia and Rascia. The latter formed a separate *zupa*, which occupies a notable place in Serbian history. This *zupa* took its name doubtless from the River Raschka, otherwise called the Rasina which flowed through it, and its capital was Rasa, the modern Novi Bazar on that river. It was probably the Rase of Constantine Porphyrogenitus who tells us Muntimir's sons took refuge there in the year 870. (Stritter, ii, 155). Kinnamos, the historian, mentions a fortress of Rason in the years 1122 and 1153, which, however, according to Schafarik, is more probably to be identified with the modern Razan on the Nischawa (*op. cit.*, ii, 261.) The *zupa* of Rascia formed the South Western portion of Serbia Proper and from it the Serbians were sometimes called Rasawe or Rassiani, in Magyar Ratz, in German Ratzen.

Within these limits Constantine mentions six towns whose sites are not clearly to be traced. 1. Destinika, the Serbian capital. This was not Trstenit as many suppose, but rather Desnitza which under the form Thysnitza is mentioned in a deed of the emperor Sigismund in 1426. Its site is probably to be sought on the Lower Drina, where the villages of Desit and Desna still remain. (*Id.* 260.) 2. Tzernabuskei, whose situation is unknown. There are several hamlets called Bucji in Serbia and a place called Bielabuca on the Trawnik in Bosnia. 3. Meigyretus perhaps the modern Medjurjrec in Yagodina. 4. Dresneik, probably the modern Dreznik in the district of Uzizk. 5. Lesnik, the modern Ljeschnitza on the Yadar. 6. Salines, now Solina (Turkish Tuzla from Tuz, Salt), a small town still existing on the Yala, a tributary of the Bosna called Sallis by Ptolemy, and Salde in the Peutingerian table. (Schafarik, ii, 261.)

Mediæval historians add several names to those given by Constantine. Thus Semberiya, which still designates the district enclosed at the point where the Save and Drina meet one another. This district was called Sumbra by the anonymous priest of Dioklea and Subria in the Dalmatian Chronicle. East of Semberiya and on the right bank of the Drina was the district of Matschwa, which in the 13th century was made into a banat, "*Banatus Machoviensis.*" (Schafarik, ii, 262.) On the river Lugomira, which falls into the Morawa, on the left below

Tiupriya, was a district called Lugomira, in the 12th and 13th centuries, and which still retains that name. (*Id.*) Kinnamos also mentions in the year 1153 a fortress of Galitch, captured by Manoel Komnenos, now in ruins. In 1162 he mentions a town, Desæ Vallum, probably the modern Tyesica, not far from Bulowan and Nisch; and in 1154 a town of Setzeniza, probably the modern Sienitza on the Wuwaz. Budimel, named as an important town in 1165, was situated in the south-west of Serbia.

The zupa or province of Zakhlum was so called, as the Emperor Constantine tells us, from being situated behind the Mountain Khlum and is a name formed like Zavolok, Zavolga, etc.; it stretched from Ragusa, in the south-east, as far as the Neretwa or Kraina in the north-west. On the east it was bounded by the mountain range separating the valleys of the Neretwa and the Drina. This range divided Zakhlum from Serbia Proper. Its neighbour on the north was Croatia and on the south Terwunia. (Schafarik, ii, 263.) Within its limits several towns are mentioned by the Greeks, whose sites, however, are not well ascertained. The position of Khlum, its principal town, is not known. Constantine says both it and Buna were placed on a mountain behind the river Bona; the Boona is a tributary of the Naretwa, and I find a place called Boona close to the junction of the two rivers. Khlum may be represented by the adjoining town of Blagai. The other towns of Zakhlum mentioned by the Emperor are—Stagnum, now called Ston, in Italian, Stagno, on the isthmus joining the peninsula of Sabioncello to the main land, Mokriskik, whose site is unknown; Yosli now Oslye, a place east of Ston in the Herzegovina; (Schafarik, *loc. cit.*); Galumainik, the modern Glumnik, in the district of Ragusa; Dobriskik the modern Dabar at the sources of the Wukostah, south-east of Liubin. (*Id.*) The narrative of the priest Diokleas compiled in the year 970 (Bohucz, *op. cit.*, 121), gives us some more facts about this district; he calls Zakhlum Podgoria, and divides it into nine gaus; Onogost, whose name survives in a small town on a lake near Niksit; Moratsha, at the sources of the river of the same name; Komerniza, on the Piwa, a tributary of the Tara; Geriko or Gaza, the modern Gačko; Netusini, *i.e.*, Newesin, a small town on the river of the same name; Guisemo, whose site is unknown: Neret, the land on the Upper Neretwa and Rama, the land on the river of the same name. The seaboard of Zakhlum with the enclosed portion of the land of the Neretshani is called Cherenania, *i.e.*, Kraina by Diokleas. He names the following gaus in this district Stantania (*i.e.*, Ston). The valley Popowo, through which according to Lucius and Farlati the Zakhlum flows. Yabeko (probably Yabiza or

Zabiza) Lucca, *i.e.*, Luka, which was afterwards famous, Schafarik says its site is unknown, but I find a place, Papavo Lucca on the peninsula of Sabioncella; Velliza (? Briesta on the same peninsula), Gorymita (site unknown), Dubrawa (ditto), and Debro, the modern Dabar. (Schafarik, ii, 265.)

At the time of the migration of the Serbians the district of Zakhlum had been devastated and depopulated by the Avars. It was then settled by a colony of Serbs. It is unknown when they began to have a separate line of princes. From 912 to 926 there reigned in Zakhlum a prince called Michel Bouseboutzes, *i.e.*, Michael, the son of Wyschewit. In 912 he made prisoner a Venetian prince who was returning from Byzantium, and sent him to Simeon, the Bulgarian king (Schafarik, ii, 255-256), and in 916 we find him informing the latter of the attitude of the Greeks, and inciting him to punish their ally, the Grand Zupan of Serbia. (Stritter, ii, 407.) Later he seems to have been on better terms with the empire, as he was nominated proconsul and patrician by Constantine, which titles were only conferred on friendly princes. Lupus Protospatha styles him, improperly, king. Pope John the Tenth wrote him a letter as well as to the Croatian Prince Tomislaf, urging him to adopt the Latin instead of the Slav language in the services of the Church, a proof of the consideration he enjoyed abroad. (Schafarik, ii, 256.) The Zupan of Zakhlum was styled Archon by the Greeks. (*Id.*)

North of the Zakh lumi dwelt the Neretshani or Pagani. Their country, according to Constantine, extended from the Neretwa (whence they derived one of their names) to the Zetina. It contained three zupas or gaus, Rastotza, Mokron, and Dalen. The two former were situated on the coast and their inhabitants were engaged in fishing. The third gau was inland and its people were agriculturists. They also had four islands off the coast, namely, Meleta (the modern Meleda), Curcura (*i.e.*, Cuzola formerly called Corcyra Nigra), Bartzo (*i.e.*, Brazza), and Pharos (which still retains its name). These islands were very beautiful and fertile, and contained many deserted towns and marshes (paludes ? meadows) where they fed their cattle. (Stritter, ii, 414.)

There were other islands which did not belong to them but were subject to the Greeks, as Choara (? Curzola), Jes (Lissa or Issa), and Lastobon (Lagosta).

According to Constantine this zupa derived its name of Paganania from the fact that its people remained Pagans after the other Serbs had been converted to Christianity. (*Id.*, ii, 411-412.) The zupa of Rastotza or Rastok took its name from the little lake of Rastok, south of the town of Makarska. The gau

of Mokron lay north of this and took its name from the same town of Makarska, which was then called Mokro; on the north it was conterminous with Croatia. The inland gau of Dalen connoted the district, which also bore the name of Dlmen or Dlmeno, and which is now called Dubno or Duvno, and forms a part of the Herzegovina. In Roman times it was called Dalminium or Delimium, and contained a town of the same name. Thence were derived the general names of Dalmatia and Dalmatæ.

In the Gau of Rastoki is the town of Ostrog, mentioned by Constantine and still called Yaostrog. It is situated on the coast, near Makarska, between the sea and Lake Yezero. The site of Labinez, another of the towns named by Constantine, is not exactly known. Fortis places it at the ruins near the village of Gradetz. Makron, a third town mentioned by him, is the modern Makarska, while the fourth one named, Berulia, or Wrulya, is a place on the coast between Omisch and Makarska.

The Neretshani, as I have said, remained pagans after their brethren had been converted, and their position on the coast, and their skill as fishermen, soon made them a prosperous community. They seem to have engaged constantly in piracy and were a terror to their neighbours, making the Roman inhabitants of the coast islands their special victims, and we are told that they attempted to invade the mainland of Croatia, but were prevented settling there by the Croats. (Stritter, ii, 414). In the year 820, the Neretshani attacked the Doge Johannes Participatius on the sea, and forced him to make a peace with them, by which he apparently agreed to pay them black mail. The Doge Tradoniko renewed the pact with Drosaik, who was doubtless their Zupan. Notwithstanding this, they made fresh attacks on the Venetian borders under their leaders Uneslaf and Diodur (the last of which is probably a corrupt name), plundered Kaorle, and made the Venetian ships in the harbour pay a large tribute. They landed on the coast and carried off much booty. They also wounded the Doge Tradoniko himself in a sea fight. This was in 840. They waylaid a messenger of Pope Hadrian, who was on his way home from the Synod of Constantinople, and the acts of the synod fell into their hands. This was in 869-870. The Doge Ursus Participatius fought without success against them. Nor did they spare their own relatives, for when in 868 the Zakhumi, Terwuni, Kanali, Ragusans and Croats went to Bari to aid the Emperor Basil against the Saracens, the Neretshani fell on their lands and devastated them cruelly. This did not, however, hinder them from intercourse of another kind, for the emperor Constantine describes how the Croat ships frequented their ports. In the year 917 we find the

Neretshani subject to the Grand Zupan Peter, but they no doubt again became free in later days. In 932 and 948 their depredations caused much trouble at Venice. (Schafarik ii, 269.) They were apparently in alliance with the citizens of Ragusa, and we are told that Vito Bobali, a leading Ragusan, left his native city with others to offer his services to Muiris prince of the Neretshani (Wilkinson, i, 280), who feared the ambitious views of Venice on the Dalmatian coast. (Wilkinson, i, 286.) The Doge Pietro Kandiano the Third sent two fleets against them, but they effected nothing, their position and the friendly alliance of the Croats making them too powerful. But their continual piracies having aroused against them their various neighbours, the Doge Pietro Orseolo the Second set sail with a formidable fleet in the spring of 997, determined to crush them. He was welcomed with great joy by the citizens of Trieste, Capo d'Istria, Pirano, Isola, Albona, Rovigno, and other towns of Istria, and then went on to Dalmatia. Leaving Zara, the Venetians proceeded to attack the Neretshani. Forty of their principal merchants were captured in a ship, while attempting to reach Ragusa from Puglia. They were assailed in their fortresses and defeated on all points. The islands of Lesina, Meleda, Curzola, and Lagosta, which they had strongly fortified, were taken, and the victorious fleet having returned to Trau, the Doge received there the submission of those of the Neretshani who had escaped the slaughter. They engaged to exact no more tribute on the sea, to burn their large boats, to indemnify the Venetian merchants for their captured cargoes, to send six hostages to the Doge, and to abstain for the future from all acts of piracy." (Wilkinson, *op. cit.*, ii, 226.) The Neretshani were thus effectually crushed: a remnant only, says Wilkinson, was found in later times among the pirates of Almissa and the subjects of the house of Kacich, who ravaged the Adriatic in the 12th and following centuries, and they were not finally conquered by the Venetians till the arrival of the Turks in Bosnia. (*Id.*, 226.)

Terwunia or Kanalia, according to Constantine, extended from Ragusa in the north to Cattaro in the south; on the west it was bounded by the Adriatic, and on the east by Serbia Proper. Its chief towns as named by him were Terwunia, the modern Trebinje in the Herzegovina; Risena the modern Risano in the Gulf of Cattaro; Hormos, probably Hurona, north of Resano, Lukavete, in Zeta, on the river of that name. According to Diokleas Terwunia at the end of the 10th century contained the following gaus: Libor (a mountain Liubomir still remains); Vetanitz whose site is unknown; Rudina (a place, Rudine under the mountain Liubomir is still known); Kruzewiça (doubtless Krushe, in

Montenegro); Urmo, the Hormos of Constantine; Ressenā, *i.e.*, Risan; Dracevitza, either Dratschewo near Trebuye and Slan, or Drakowittza, a castle between Cattaro and Ragusa; Canali, *i.e.*, Kanawlie, a small district stretching from Epidaurus (Ragusa Vecchia), along the coast of the gulf of Cattaro, which was so called down to the 18th century; and lastly, Gernovitza, whose site is not known. Terwunia itself, according to Schafarik, is not a Slavic name. He deems it a corruption of the Illyric Latin Travunia, *i.e.*, trans. *Боввос*, and a name of the same genus as Tramontana, etc., while Kanalia, which Constantine derives from Kolnitztza (*vid. plaustrī*) was no doubt derived, as Stritter says, from the famous aqueduct (canal) which supplied Epidaurus with water, of which ruins with Roman inscriptions still remain. (Stritter, ii, 409). Ragusa, the Emperor tells us, was on the confines of the Zachlumi and the Terwuni, and paid tribute to the princes of both; the citizens had vineyards in either district. (Stritter, ii, 407 and 409.)

The later historians of Ragusa, who are not of much authority, mention an attack by the Terwuni on Epidaurus about 640–650, of their alliance with the Saracens, and the destruction of Epidaurus by the two combined in 656.

The Zupans of Terwunia acquired a temporary independence in the first half of the 9th century, when we read that the Grand Zupan Wlastimir gave his daughter in marriage to Kranian the son of Bela, Zupan of Terwunia, gave him the title of prince, and released him from his jurisdiction. (Stritter, ii, 408.) About this time we read that the citizens of Ragusa gained a victory over the people of Terwunia and Zakhlum, and in 831 they obtained considerable advantages by a treaty made with the chief of Terwunia. (Wilkinson, *op. cit.*, i, 278.) Kranian was succeeded by his son Phalimer, and he by his son Tzutzimir. (Stritter, *id.*) It would seem they afterwards lost their independence, for the Emperor Constantine makes the Terwunians subordinate to the Grand Zupans. (*Id.*)

Having surveyed the topography of Serbia Proper we will now turn to the other zupas or gaus into which the land was divided in the time of Constantine, and begin with the most southern. This was called Dioklea by the Greeks and Romans, and by the Serbians Duklia, and in later times Zenta or Zeta. It comprised the southern part of the modern Montenegro and a portion of Northern Albania. Constantine has made a curious blunder about the origin of the name. He tells us it was so called from a city built by Diocletian, while the fact is that Diocletian took his name from his own mother city. It was an ancient city, was called Doklea by Ptolemy and Dioklea by Aurelius Victor. Pliny speaks of a people whom he calls

Docleatæ. The Serbs called it Dukla, and it is curious that the Ruthenians, north of the Carpathians, also had a town called Dukla. It was devastated in the 10th century by the Bulgarians, but revived, for Kinnamos in describing its capture, by John Ducas in 1162, calls it a very famous town. King Milutin assigned it as the residence of his blinded son, Stephen, in 1317. It was situated at the outfall of the river Zeta into the Moratsha, and its ruins are still called Dukliangrad; from them was built the later town of Podgoritza. (Schafarik, ii, 273.) The sites of the other towns of the district mentioned by Constantine are not so certain, Gradeta is probably the modern Gradit, above Scutari. Nugrade is perhaps Gradatz in Montenegro. Lonto is called Lunta and Luncza on old maps, and Linda on modern ones, and is north-east of Scutari. The monk, Diokleas, calls the district of Dioklea, Zenta or Zeta, a name derived no doubt from the river Zeta. He tells us it contained nine gaus. Lusca probably the modern Nahiya Lieshanska. Padluga whose site is unknown. Gorska, also unknown. Eupelnik ditto. Oblquit, the modern Oblatshit. Propartna, now Papratnitza in Lieshanka. Kremeniza also unknown, but reminding one of a Gallician town. Budua the modern Badua, near the coast. Kuzewa, perhaps Kutie or Kutisti in Montenegro, and Gripuli, probably Krtoli, near Cattaro. From the position of these towns it would seem that Dioklea was separated from Terwunia by the gulf of Cattaro and the mountains which separate Grahovo from Bielitza; from Albania by the River Drimza, and a line drawn from Scutari to Antivari on the sea; from Serbia by Raskkian mountains beyond the lake of Plawno, and from Zakhuma by the mountains at the sources of the Moratsha.

Besides the towns above named there were others of some fame in early times within the district; thus Budimal on the Moratsha where the village of Budina still remains, Scutari the Skodra of the Romans, Cattaro the Dekatera of Constantine, which was ravaged by the Saracens in 867. The Albanian towns of Antivari, Ulcin, Lesch, and Daratsh were also largely peopled at one time by immigrants from the neighbouring Dioklea. (*Id.*, 274-5.)

I have now completed a hurried survey of the Southern Serbs, and the main points which I wish to emphasize are, first, that amidst the disjointed and disintegrated history of these parts, and beneath a seeming variety of names, Croats, Bosnians, Montenegrins, Herzegovinians, etc., we have in fact but one race, with one origin; namely, the great Serbian stock. Secondly, that this race first migrated to the south of the Danube and the Save and occupied its present country at the

beginning of the 7th century; thirdly, that like other Slavic races its leaders were probably of another stock, belonging, in this case, to the great Alanic family, and that it was from these leaders that the Serbs received their name; and lastly, that the main body of the race is of the same stock as the Ruthenians of Galicia and its borders. By pushing the Serbs out of their present country and remitting them to the north of the Carpathians we, *pro tanto*, simplify very greatly the ethnographic map of Europe in early times. Our next paper will deal with another line of migration from the same district, which tended westwards and northwards, and we shall treat of the Sorabians, or Northern Serbs, and the Obotriti.

1715-8

THE
JOURNAL
OF THE
ANTHROPOLOGICAL INSTITUTE
OF
GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND.



VOL. IX.

LONDON:
PUBLISHED FOR
The Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland,
BY
TRÜBNER & CO., 57 & 59, LUDGATE HILL.
All Rights Reserved.
1880.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
I. Exhibition of Cranium of a Native of one of the Fiji Islands. By Prof. W. H. FLOWER, F.R.S., Vice-President	2
II. The Primitive Human Family. By C. STANILAND WAKE, Esq., M.A.I.	3
III. On an Echelle de Couleurs, published by the Société Sténocromique of Paris. By E. W. BRABROOK, Esq., F.S.A., Director	19
IV. Remarks on the Geographical Distribution of Games. By E. B. TYLOR, Esq., F.R.S., President	23
V. On some Rock Carvings found in the neighbourhood of Sydney. By Sir CHARLES NICHOLSON, Bart., LL.D. ..	31
VI. Relationships and the Names used for them among the Peoples of Madagascar, chiefly the Hovas; together with Observations upon Marriage Customs and Morals among the Malagasy. By the Rev. JAMES SIBREE, Junior ..	35
VII. Trellech. By F. G. HILTON PRICE, Esq., F.G.S., Treasurer	51
VIII. History of the South-Western Barbarians and Chaou-Séen. Translated from the "Tseen Han Shoo," Book 95. By A. WYLIE, Esq. With an Introduction, by H. H. HOWORTH, Esq., F.S.A.	53
IX. Rag-Bushes and Kindred Observances. By M. J. WALHOUSE, Esq., F.R.A.S.	97
X. On the Osteology and Affinities of the Natives of the Andaman Islands. By Prof. W. H. FLOWER, F.R.S., Vice- President	108
XI. Notes on some Irish Antiquities. By A. L. LEWIS, Esq., M.A.I.	137
XII. Notes on some Cornish and Irish Pre-historic Monuments. By Miss A. W. BUCKLAND	146
XIII. Gaelic Mythology. By HECTOR MACLEAN, Esq. ..	167
XIV. The Spread of the Slaves, Part III. The Northern Serbs or Sorabians, and the Obodriti. By H. H. HOWORTH, Esq., F.S.A.	181

from the combustion of fuel, or the snuff of a candle. The death of Goll is the obscuration of the light of the setting sun by the dark clouds that gather over him on the western horizon.

NOTE.—The name *Goll* is not, probably, identical with the homonym *goll*, blind one-eyed; it is more likely to be cognate with the Welsh *golen* and the Beton *Goulon*, "light."

THE SPREAD of the SLAVES. Part III.

THE NORTHERN SERBS or SORABIANS and the OBODRITI.

By H. H. HOWORTH, Esq., F.S.A.

Section I.

IN the two previous papers of this series we have dealt with a number of tribes whose homogeneous character is remarkable, and who have more or less a continuous history which can be followed without difficulty. We can trace them from their first home in the country north of the Carpathians until they occupied a large portion of European Turkey, and we can study their descendants there in an unmixed and largely unsophisticated condition. Subjects of the Turks, they have mixed little with them or their other neighbours, and in language and many other characteristics they are very much what their ancestors in the seventh century were.

We have now to consider a more difficult and complicated series of tribes, who migrated in a different direction and who, after being broken to pieces and disintegrated by their German neighbours, have been largely absorbed by them. Over large areas they no longer exist as Slaves. Their language has been altered and changed, and they are to all intents and purposes Germans. This increases largely the difficulty of following their history, which is further complicated by the fact that Slaves belonging to two of the great divisions of the race were possibly settled in their area, and that they have, in our view, been confounded together. This will involve our taking a somewhat minute survey of these tribes.

They are all classed together by Schafarik under the name of Polabian Slaves, a name derived from their living on the Elbe. Po meaning on, while Labe is the Slavic name for the Elbe, a name which is constructed in the same manner as Pomorianan,

which similarly means those living on the sea. This is not a bad generic name for them, except for the fact that one of the tribes is known specifically as Polabi, so that we have to use the term both in a generic and specific sense. Schafarik also includes in the name tribes which I believe belonged to two distinct divisions of the Slaves, and which we shall attempt to discriminate. These divisions were the two grand sections of Eastern and Western Slaves. The Serbs and Russians are typical examples of the former, while the Poles and Bohemians are similar examples of the latter. This second class we are not now dealing with, consequently we shall separate those tribes which, in our view, belong to it. I would say *in limine* that the main reason for holding the view here urged is the consistent notice which the Frank annalists give of the alliances and policy of these tribes. While they mention the Wiltzi as the persistent enemies of the Franks, and as the allies of the Saxons, the Obodriti and their associated tribes are found constantly in alliance with the Franks, and at issue with their rivals the Saxons. This is so constant that I cannot doubt that the two tribes belonged to different divisions of the race, a view which is largely confirmed when we find that the Wiltzi are actually mentioned by Ptolemy, and placed by him on the Oder, while the other tribes, their rivals, are not named by him, but their country is made the home of a series of German tribes. When we come to discriminate between the two in detail, the matter becomes very difficult; our best guide, language, is only partially available, for the difference which so easily marks off the dialects of the Eastern and Western Slaves has largely disappeared in consequence of the adoption of German as the mother-tongue of all the tribes. Schafarik, as I have said, classes them all together. Much of what follows is necessarily tentative, and in some cases must always remain so; but it is the best result which seems to me at present available after weighing the evidence. The old indigenous stock of Slaves of the Oder and its neighbourhood belonged to the Western Slavic division, of which the Poles and Bohemians are the chief factors. The intruding Slaves perhaps belonged to the Eastern section, of which the Russians and Serbs are the most typical specimens. It is with the intruders we have at present to deal.

I believe they may be roughly divided into three sections: the Obodriti and Wagrians in Mecklenburgh; the Sorabians or Serbians Proper, living in the district called Sorabia, in Spruner's map, number 31, and including also large colonies west of the Elbe, and a strip of territory along that river, joining them to the Obodriti. These, I believe, were the White Serbians of Constan-

tine Porphyrogenitus; and thirdly, the people of Upper and Lower Lusatia and of Silesia who were, as I believe, the White Croats of the same author (*vide infra*). We will now examine these three divisions in detail beginning with the Obodriti.

When we first meet with the Obodriti in the pages of the Frank annalists, they were, as I have said, closely allied with the Franks, while their enemies and rivals, the Wiltzi, were allies of the Saxons. So much was this recognised, that in the "*Annales Laureshammenses*," under the year 798 we read of "*Slavi nostri qui dicuntur Abotriti*" (Pertz i, 37). This feud between them and their neighbours on either hand, which was probably the reason for their close friendship with the Franks, when read with the fact that they are not named by the classical authors, makes it exceedingly probable that they were an intrusive population into this area; and this again is more than confirmed when we find, as I have shown, that there were Obodriti elsewhere, namely, on the Danube. This last fact shows that the race was broken into fragments. We shall therefore have no difficulty in treating the Northern Obodriti as an immigrant race. This clears the way considerably, and we can the more easily inquire who they were and whence they came. The name occurs in various forms, as Abotriti, Abodriti, Abotridi, Obotitri, Obodriti, Apdrede, Afdrede, Nortabtrezi, etc. (Schafarik ii, 587). Zeuss in one of his notes suggests that the name is compounded of Ob and Otriti or Odriti, and connects them with the River Oder. But this seems to be very unsatisfactory as an etymology, and I very much prefer the authority of the great Slavic ethnologist, Schafarik, who tells us it is clearly a Slavic name, and compares with it Bodrica in the government of Witepsk, Bedrici in the government of Kaluga Biedrzyce, the name of four places in the government of Plotsk. Bedrc, in the Bernese Alps, a town Bidrici in a document of the Emperor Otho in 949, a town of the same name in a document of 965, Bidrizi in 992, Bitrizi in 995, and still known as Biederitz, lastly the name of the castle of Bodrok, and the circle or province of Bodrog (stolice Bodrocka) in Southern Hungary (Schafarik ii, 588). The same author concludes that the name is ultimately derived from the word "bedr" or "bodr," meaning (vigil, strenuus) the German bieder, the termination in Abtrezi Bidrizi, etc., being the patronymic "ici," and Bodr or Bodrog being a man's name, the primæval eponymos of the race, so that Obodriti or Abtrezi simply means the tribe or descendants of Bodr or Bodrog, as the Inglings, Scioldings, etc., mean the clan of Ingve, Sciold, and so on. This is the usual way in which the neighbouring tribes were named, and in receiving the sanction of such a great Slavic scholar as Schafarik, we may safely put aside that of

Zeuss, and discard the connection between the Obodriti and the River Oder, which was far away from their sites when we first discover them. The name Obodriti seems to have been used in two ways, generically and specifically. Generically it seems, as Schafarik, Zeuss, and others are agreed, to have included a number of small neighbouring tribes, who are respectively known as the Wagrians, Polabians, Smolingians or Smel-dingians, Linones, Bethenici, and Warnabi. At other times the name Obodriti was a specific one, and limited to a special tribe. This special tribe of Obodriti lay immediately on the Baltic between the Rivers Warnof and Trave. It was bounded on the west by the Wagrians, on the east by the Wiltzi, and on the south by the Polabians.

Its chief towns were Rereg or Reric, from which they were also known as Reregi—Schafarik connects this name with Rarog the falco cyanopus, and mentions a castle of the same name in the Voievodshaft of Plock, and with such names of towns and castles in Serbia as Sokol (a falcon), Orel (an eagle) and Gestrab (a hawk)—two, Roztok; three, Zwerin or Schwerin, Lubof, called by the Germans Mickililnburg, *i.e.* great town Il of Zwanof, etc., etc. (Schafarik, 588).

The Wagrians, as I have said, bounded the Obodriti proper on the west. They lived in the north-eastern part of Holstein, and were bounded on the north by the Eider, on the east by the Baltic, on the west by the Swentina, the Ploner Lake, and the Birzing. On the west they were conterminous with the so-called Limes Saxonius, and on the south-west with the Polabi. Their chief towns were Stargard or Oldenburg, Lutilnburg, now Liutenburg and Bukowec, now called Lubeck, Plona, and Utin. Schafarik gives the various forms of the name as Wagri, Wagri, Waigri, Wagrii, and Waari, and says he neither knows the right form of the name, nor its meaning; but this last form, which is taken from Widukind, the Saxon annalist, shows that the name is a corruption of the old name, Varini or Werini, a tribe which was the neighbour and relative of that of the Angli, and it is more than probable that the Slavic Wagrians were so called only when they invaded and occupied this district, formerly inhabited by the Varini. It has been generally considered that this occupation took place in the year 804, when we are told Charlemagne gave the land of those Transalbingian Saxons, whom he dispossessed, to the Obodriti. I believe, therefore, that they were a comparatively recent section of the Slaves, formed by emigrants from the country of the Obodriti proper. When these colonists occupied Wagria, they also, apparently, took possession of the Island of Femern, opposite the Peninsula of Aldenburgh, which in the days of Helmold was occupied by Slaves (Zeuss, 654).

South of the Obodriti proper and the Wagri were the Polabi, the Polabingi of Adam of Bremen and the anonymous "Annalista Saxo," and whose name, as I have shown, simply means the dwellers on the Elbe. That river bounded them on the south-west, and separated them from Saxony. On the west they were bounded by the "Limes Saxonicus," on the north by the Obodriti and Wagri, and on the east by the Warnabi and Linones. Their chief towns were Ratibor, called Raceburg in a document of the year 1154, and Racisburg by Adam of Bremen. Within their land was also Smilowopole. "In terram Polaborum in campum qui dicitur Smilowe" (Helmold, c. 34, p. 88, Schafarik, ii, 589). The former may be compared with the name Ratz and Rassa, a well-known town of the Southern Serbs, which occupied us in our last paper. Smilowopole means the country of Smilowe. I have little doubt that these Polabi were of the same race as the Obodriti, and doubtless a section of them.

According to Schafarik, the Smolnizi were a section of the Polabi. They lived between the modern towns of Boizenburgh and Dömitz. They are mentioned by the Bavarian geographer under the name of Smeldingon. The Frankish annalists refer to them, in the year 808, under the style of Smeldingi. In the Chron. Moissiac. it is said under the year 809, that the Saxons crossed the Elbe and attacked a town of "our Winidi," called "Semeldinc Connoburg," *i.e.*, the town of the Smeldingi. The fact that these Smeldings are called "our Winidi," by the Frankish Chronicle, shows they belonged to the same section as the Obodriti, and not to the rival race of the Wiltzi, and what makes this almost certain is that we find tribes of a similar name among the Eastern Slaves. One of these gave its name to Smolensk, a famous town of White Russia; while another section of them is found on the south of Bulgaria, on the borders of Thrace and Macedonia, on the River Meta, and was known as Smoleny (Schafarik, ii, 221). Many names in Russia are also derived from them, as Smolevici, Smolianka, a river Smoliaz and Smolin, in the government of Chernigof, Smolianici, Smolaki in that of Smolensk, Smoliany in that of Mohilef and Smolany, Smolarze, Smolen, Smolice, Smolinki, etc., in Poland. (*Id.* 590.)

The termination "ici" in some of these names, and of "ing" in Smolding, shows that the name is a clan name connected with some patronym, Smol or Smold. Their chief town seems to have been called Connoburgh, which according to Leutsch is represented by a place called Kanneburgh, on the road from Zehdenik to Lychno, and according to Ledebur is Connof on the Eldena (Schafarik, ii, 590). The Linones bordered on the Polabi on the east, no doubt occupying the modern "Gau" of Linagga (Spruner's Atlas, map 31). They were limited on

the north-east by the Warnabi, on the south-west by the Elbe, on the south by the Bethenici, and on the east by the Wiltzi, and are named by the Carolingian historians in connection with the Smeldings, thus: "Filius imperatoris Karlus Albiam ponte junxit, et exercitum cui præerat in Linones et Smeldingos transposuit, etc." (Eginhardt, Pertz i, 195), and elsewhere (Zeuss, 651). They were also called Lini, Linai, Lanai, Linaa, Lingones, Linones and Hilinones. Schafarik has argued that the indigenous name was Glinani, and derives it from "glinā," which was applied to many rivers, streams, etc. (*op. cit.*, 591). Their chief towns were called Lentschin, Lunkini, or Lunzin, and in later times Lentsin and Leontia, the modern Lenzen; and Potlustin the modern Puttlitz.

The Linones are made a section of the Obodriti by Schafarik, a view which is very probable. Colonies of the Linones apparently found their way west of the Elbe. The river called Lūna by the Germans, and Glinā by the Slaves, on which the modern city of Lüneburgh is situated, reminds us of this. In the year 795 the Fuldensian Annals mention that Ulcān, the Prince of the Obodriti, having been captured by the Saxons, died in the town of Liuni near the Elbe. Widukind glosses this as the monastery of Lüne in the Bardengau (Schafarik, ii, 590). The Linones are mentioned in 808 by Eginhardt, both in the annals and in the life of Charlemagne. They are called Lini by the Poeta Saxo, Linai and Lanai in the Chron. Moissiacense. In the Bertinian Annals of the year 839, and those of Fulda of the years 858 and 877, they are called Linones; by the Bavarian geographer, Linaa, and he says they possessed seven towns: "Linaa est populus, qui habet civitates VII." In a deed of Otho the First, dated in 946, the district is called Linagga; Adam of Bremen calls them Lingones; Helmold, Lingones, Lini, and Linoges; and the Annalista Saxo of 952, Linones. In some MSS. of Eginhardt, the name appears as "Hilinones," "Hilinonicum bellum," whence, as I have said, Schafarik, following Grimm, concludes that the indigenous name of the tribe was Glin, Glinai, or Glinsti.

We also find the name in the district between the towns of Arendsee and Lauchof, which was formerly called Lenegon or Lennegou, and referred to in a deed of Albert the Second, dated in 1208, as Linegow (Wersebe, Elbe Gaue, 254). I would remark that the name Uelzen which occurs in the district of Bardengau in Wersebe's map, has nothing to do with the Wiltzi, but is a corruption of Ulleshem, as the name is spelt in a document of 1142. (*Id.*, 247.)

East of the Polabi, properly so called, were the Warnabi or Wrani, and who are made a part of the Obodriti by Schafarik, as I think justly. By Adam of Bremen they are called

Warnabi or Warnahi. Helmold calls them Warnavi, and the Annalista Saxo, Warnabi. In a document of Pope Urban the Third, dated in 1185, their country is called Warnowe, in another of Pope Clement the Third, dated in 1189, Warnonwe, while in a third of 1222 it is called Wornawe. They were also known as Wrani, Wranovi, and Wranefzi. Their name is undoubtedly derived from the river Warnof, also called Wrana and Wranawa. We find the name occurring among the Eastern Slaves as Warna or Varna in Bulgaria, the River Warnawa in the Russian Government of Tambof, and the village of Warnowici in Kurland. The name is probably not originally Slavic, for the Teutonic Warini, who occupied the area of these Slavic Warnavi in classical times, bear a name clearly derived from the same root. Among the towns of the Warnabi were Malikof, the modern Malchhof, Wranowo (now Warnou), Werle, Warle, or Wurle, etc. (Schafarik, ii, 592-593).

The land of Warnowe is mentioned in a marked manner in a description of the boundaries of the bishopric of Mecklenburg in 1185, which runs thus: "*Silva, quæ distinguit terras Havel- liere (i.e., Havelland), scilicet et Muritz, eandem terram quoque Muritz et Vepero cum terminis suis ad terram Warnowe ex utraque parte fluminis quod Eldene dicitur usque ad castrum Grabow . . .*" While in a document of 1189 we read: "*Dis- tinguit tandem terram Möritz et Veprouve cum omnibus terminis suis ad terram quæ Warnowe vocatur, includens et terram War- nouwe cum terminis suis ex utraque parte fluminis quod Eldena dicitur usque ad castrum quod Grabou nuncupatur*" (Zeuss, 653).

Near Grabof, south of the Elde, and just on the borders of the Grand Duchy of Mecklenburgh, is a village called Warnof, which doubtless received its name from this people.

With the Linones are named the Bethenici, who are referred to among the Frank annalists, only in the Chron. Moissiac. under the year 811, where this chronicler writes, "*ul tra Albiam ad illos Slavos que nominantur Lanâi et Bethenzi.*" (Variants of this name occur as Bethenzr, Bechelenzi, and Bethelclereri.) The Bavarian geographer speaks of them thus: "*Prope illis (Linaa) resident quos vocant Bethenici et Smeldingon et Morizani.*" Dithmar, says Schafarik, speaks of a special class of citizen warriors called Vethenici, and speaks of them thus: "*In ea parte (Misnæ urbis), qua satellites habitant, dicti Slavonice Vethenici, Cukesburgienses.*" Schafarik explains the name by the word wetnik, in plural wetnici (the Serbian cetnik cetniki), derived from the root wet, whence weta (habitaculum), powet (pagus), witati (habitare) or from wetiti, zawetiti, hajiti, gennan- hâgen, a fence.

Among the Drewani a town is called weika, where as in

other words the k stands for t; with wetnik may also be compared the Lithuan title wetininkas. Cukesburgenses, *i.e.*, Kukesburger, is explained as meaning speculatores, excubitores, custodes arcis vel burgi cujusdam. It would therefore seem that the name Bethenici represents a class of men, and has no ethnic value, and this is confirmed by the fact that it has left no traces in the topography of the district, for Pertz is clearly mistaken in connecting it with Priegnitz (Schafarik, 591-592, and notes). That name which now connotes the country south of Mecklenburgh, and bounded on the west by the Elbe, is doubtless derived from the Brizani. Helmold mentions these last with the Stoderani, saying: "Brizanorum et Stoderanorum populi qui Havelberg et Brandenburg habitant" (Zeuss, 651). Havelberg is a well known town. In the district of Priegnitz, the chief centre is Pritzwalk, which retains the name of the Brizani more closely. Zeuss mentions Treuenbrietzen, a place I cannot find on my maps, as also connected with them. In a document of Otho the First, dated in 946, we find the name Nieleticigau applied to this district; we are told the gau contained the towns of Havelberg and Nizem, now called Nizof, from which latter it doubtless derived this name, which is a mere synonym with Brizani for the people of Havelberg.

The Brizani probably occupied the borders of the Elbe, as far south as the Spree, for in Spruner's map of the gaus in this district, I find a name Priecipini, near the modern Jerichof, and a name Pricervi, now called Pritzerbe, which are probably derived from the Brizani, and are roughly made the southern boundary of the Bethenici by Spruner. The name Brizani connects this tribe with the Eastern Slaves, among whom we have the town of Pruzany in the government of Grodno, while "slobody Pruzenske" are named in a deed of 1389, as subordinate to Moscow.

There was a district of Berzitæ in Macedonia; we also find the names Berse and Bersen in Kurland, Berzy, and Berzany, etc., in Lithuania, Werezani and Warzino, Werzava, Werezani, Werzali, and Werzby in Russia, and Bersiti in Serbia (Schafarik, ii, 143-144).

Besides this evidence we have the further fact that the subordinate gau of Nieletici already named, has its exact counterpart in that of Neletici, a gau of the Sorabians to which I shall refer presently. Another subordinate gau of the Brizani was that of Liezizi, marked on Spruner's map as occupying the southern part of the land of the Bethenici. It was situated between the Havel and the Elbe, in the district called in later times Klytz. This gau is mentioned in a deed of Otho the First, dated in 937, as Ligzice, in another of the same year as Ligsitze, and in a third of 946 as Liezizi or Liczizi.

Bordering the Bethenici on the south were the Morizani, who were bounded on the west by the Elbe, on the east by the Wiltzi, and on the south by the Sorabi. Their name is variously spelt as Mortsani, Moraciani, Moroszani, Moritzani, Mrocini, Moresceni, and Mrozini, while the gau which still remains, and which took its name from them, is called Morazena, Morozini, etc., and also Marscinerlande (Schafarik, 584). In the *Descriptio Civitatum*, quoted by Zeuss, we are told: "Erat illic (ad Havelam), vastissima silva, qua diebus quinque transmissa venit ad stagnum miræ longitudinis . . . Erat etiam illic barbarorum natio quæ Moriz vocabatur" (Zeuss, 652).

There can be no doubt that they took their name from this marsh or moratscha, and that their name merely means Marshmen. A similar Morasa is to be found in Serbia.

Their chief towns were Liezke, Luborn, Tuchim, Bedrici, Nedelize, Guntmiri, Grabova, Budin, etc. (Schafarik, ii, 585).

They are mentioned in connection with the Smeldingi and Bethenici (Zeuss, 652). This fact and the important one that one of their towns was called Bedrici, which is probably but another form of Bodrizi, the native name of the Obodriti, makes it very probable that like the other tribes already named, the Morizani were a section of the Northern Obodriti—a view which coincides with the fact that in the excellent map of the gaus of this district already quoted, the Morizani are separated and distinguished sharply from the Wiltzi.

I have now analyzed the various small sections which formed the nation of the Obodriti east of the Elbe, and have pointed out how they were situated between that river and the Wilzi. Now the Wilzi were a very aggressive people, and in constant feud with them, and we cannot doubt that they exercised a considerable pressure upon them. Even without this the more or less vacant lands on the west of the Lower Elbe would otherwise have naturally been colonized by emigrants from the eastern bank. I have already mentioned how it is supposed that Lüneburgh took its name from such a colony of the Linones. They doubtless also gave its name to the town Liuni, where in 795 the Saxons killed the Obodritan chief, named Ulcan, and which has been identified as the monastery of Lune, between Bardewik and Lüneburg. But besides these Linones there were other Slaves, west of the Elbe, who were doubtless also Obodriti. Thus there were the Drewani, who lived on the banks of the Jeetze, a western feeder of the Elbe, on which is the town of Salzwedel. Their name is derived from *drewo* (wood) and simply meant woodmen, being the Slavic equivalent of Holsati; another tribe of Drewani lived in Russia. Schafarik says that according to the evidence of several German scholars, such as Henning,

Keyssler, Wersebe, etc., all the district on both sides the Jeetze is known as the Wendish district, and was divided into several sections, as Drewanerland on the west of the Jeetze, between the towns Welzen, Lühhof, and Dannenberg; Glinianerland, in German, Lengof, or Lennigof on the eastern side of the Jeetze, Geyr or Kheyr, Nöring or Nehring, etc. In this district are several towns whose names prove the Slavic character of the old inhabitants.

Thus, Lühhof, the Slavic Liaukhef or Loikhowie, Dannenberg, whose Slavic name was Woikam and Weidors; Hitsaker, in Slavic Liauncii; Wustrof, in Slavic Wastrüf; Bergen, Slavic Iiorska; and Klenze or Claniki, Slavic Klonzka (Schafarik, 593). Lüneburgh itself, Glein, *i.e.*, Glin, Salzwedel, Slavic Lozdit or Lozdi; Gartin, Gorstii; Schnakenburg, Godegord, *i.e.*, Hadj Hrad, or snake town, Arendzee, Wlazdeiske, etc. (*id.*, note 3). South of this area is the district now known as Altmark, *i.e.*, the old frontier, which was formerly known as Beleseim, Belesem, Belshem, Belsheim, Balsamia terra, Balsamerland, Belxa. Zeuss explains the name as derived from the Slavic Bielozeria, Bielazemia, White Land. It was a mere western prolongation of the marshes on the eastern side of the Elbe, and its German names show by whom it was occupied. These were Wischweneden and Rohrweneden. Here too, in documents of the tenth and eleventh centuries, we find Slavic names, such as Glenobie, Centonie, Bremetzhe, Slautiz, etc. (Schafarik, 593 and 594, and note 1, 594).

If we move further south we still find traces of old Slavic occupancy. Slavic names occur along the whole left bank of the Ohre, a western tributary of the Elbe.

Thus we read in a document dated in 937, in the time of Otho the Great: "Ex aquilonali parte Horaba fluminis in locis ita nominatis, Mosan, Pelinizi, Dudizi, Wizoboro, Velbpuchi, Zelici."

Dithmar gives us the Slavic name of Wolmirstadt in the phrase "urbs Ualmerstidi Slavonice autem Ustuire eo quod Ara et Albis fluvii hic conveniunt, vocata." The name is derived probably from Usta, mouth, the Ohre probably having formerly fallen into the Elbe at this point (Zeuss, 660). In this neighbourhood we have other traces of Slavic occupancy in the old names Jeseritz (Jazarice), Mieste (miesto), Tarnewitz (Tarnowice, compare Polish Tarnof), Dolnitz (Dolnice), Kobbeltz (Cobbelici in old deeds), Wendisch Brome, Mellin (Bohemian, Malin); and on the eastern side of the Stöcken Lake we have the towns of Berchmere, Abbanthorp, Varenthorp, Pychenuzen, Ellenbeke, Watekoten, Budenstede; of which we are told, in a deed of 1161, "quarum incolæ adhuc Sclavi erant" (Zeuss, 660). The Slavic language survived in some of the places on the west of the Elbe

till the last century, and divine service was said at Wustrof in Slavic as late as 1751 (Zeuss, 661).

These Slaves west of the Elbe, I consider, as others have done, to have been colonies from the other side of the river: to have been in fact Obodriti, who perhaps retired before the aggressive policy of the Wiltzi.

On moving southwards we enter the land of the Sorabians proper. In contact with the Morizani, and bounding them on the south was the gau of Zerbisti, whose name survives in Zerbst. It was bounded on the east by Lusatia, and on two other sides by the Elbe. The name occurs in a deed of 949 as Ciervisti, in another of 975 as Kirrusti, and in later ones of 1103 and 1161 as Zerbiste and Cervisti. It is a palpable derivative of Serb, and several names of villages, such as Zurbici, Zribenz, Zorbwech, Serebez, etc., between the Elbe and Saale, show very plainly what was the native stock here.

In Spruner's map we find the neighbouring gau of Plone also assigned to the Sorabians. This gau derives its name from the River Plona, between which the Havel, the Nuthe, and the gau of Zerbisti, it is situated. It is called Ploni in 949, etc. In other early deeds this gau is otherwise called Zucha, the modern Zaukhe (Schafarik, ii, 386). South of Zerbisti and Ploni we have a number of small gaus. Two of these bear the name of Nisseni, and in contact with the Zerbisti and the other higher up the Elbe, between the Dalameni and the Milciani.

The two gaus are separated from one another. Their situation and boundaries may be admirably studied in Spruner's excellent map of the gaus of Slavania. The name occurs in deeds of Otho the First, dated in 948, 965, and 967, as Nisizi, Nizizi (the province), and Nisisi. In others of Otho the Second, of 973, 980, and 997, as Nitaze, Nikiki, and Nizizi. In one of Henry, of the year 1004, as Nizisi. In Dithmar, in 1018, as Nicicisi; in another deed of Henry, in 1069, as Niciza. In one of Count Adalbert, in 1073, as Nithsice, etc. In this gau we find the town of Belgern mentioned as early as 975, under the name of Belogora; Treskovo, in 1130; Sremsnica, in 1130; Mezumroka, in 981, etc.

South of the gau just described was that of Susali. The Susoli or Siusli are mentioned in the Fulda Annals, under the years 869, 874, and 877, and are called Siusli and Siusili; Alfred the Great calls them Syssyle or Sysele.

In deeds of the time of Otho the First, dated in 961, Siusile; in another of 965, a town of Susili is mentioned; in another the gau is called Siusilli; it is called Suselitz in one of 973, of Otho the Second; and Siusili in two of Otho the Third, dated in 985. In another of the Emperor Henry the Second, of 1004, the town

is called Siusili. Dithmar calls the gau Siusuli and Siusili; Helmold, Susieti. That the Siusili were Slaves is clear from the statement in the Fulda Annals, where we read of the "Scravi qui vocantur Siusli," and in deeds of Otho the Second, of 985, with the phrase "terra Slavonica Siuseli." The old towns within its borders also bear names which are clearly Slavic, Vetowizi, Resin, Kryn, Tornaf, Kemnitz, Mortitz, Rokenitz, Doberschwitz, Strelen, etc. The name of the tribe occurs in the neighbouring gau. In that of Nizizi we have the town of Zulsdorf mentioned as early as the reign of Otho the First as Susili (Schafarik, ii, 603). I find in Spruner's map a place, Suseliz, in the small gau of Weitaba. Helmold mentions a district called Susla in Wagria, where Adolf the Count of Wagria, on the extermination of the Slaves, in 1139, planted some Friesians, and where the village of Susil still survives (Schafarik, ii, 603). Further north still, we have in the extreme northern peninsula of Jutland a name which is very embarrassing. This peninsula is called Wend Syssel, and it has been suggested, with some probability, that it took its name from another section of the Susili, who found their way there at the time of the northern migration of the Obodriti. The name is also a familiar one in Russia. (*Id.*, ii, 116 and 117.)

Let us now revert to the Susali on the Middle Elbe. West of them and south of the Elbe, we find several small gau, namely, Serimunt, Nudhice, and Nelectice. Serimunt, formerly Zermunti, lies between the Saale, the Elbe, and the Mulde. It is first mentioned in a deed of Otho the First, in 945, as Ser-munti and Serimuntelande; in a deed of 952, Serimunt; in 964, Sermunt; in 965, Sirimunti; in one of Otho the Second of 973, we have mention of a Mark of Serimodem; in 974 we meet with Seremode; in 978, Zermute; in 980, Sirmunti; in 986, Cirimundi; in 992, Sirimunti, etc.

The name may be compared with those of Zirmuny and Zirmunty, in Lithuania (Schafarik, ii, 60). We may also compare with it the name of the town of Inner Sarmatia, mentioned by Ptolemy, which he calls Σερμων (*id.*, i, 512), and the Croatian chieftain's name of Sermon, who had his seat at Srem. (*Id.*, ii, 291 and 302.)

The Nudhice lay to the south-west of the Sirmunti and east of the Saale. Their name still survives in the village of Neutz. The gau is mentioned in two deeds of Otho the First, and is there called Nudzici, and in one of 965, Nudhici.

West of the Elbe, "in Suchalande," we meet with the mention of a priest "de Nydicen," in a deed of 1190. In Russia we have places called Nudyci, in Minsk, Vologda, etc., and in Bohemia, the names Nutice, Nucice, and Nuzice. South of this

gau lay that of Nelectice, between the Saale, the Elster, and the land of the Kolidizi. We have already met with a gau with a similar name in the land of the Brizani further north. In two deeds of 961, the name is spelt Neletici; in one of Otho the Second, of 973, Neletiki or Neletizi; and in another of 975, Neletiki. Leutsch thinks the name survives in the modern Neglitz (Schafarik, ii, 605).

North of the Nelectici and east of the Nudhici lived the Coledizi, probably so called, according to Schafarik, from the Goddess Koleda, as the Staditzi and Stoderani were probably named from the God Stado or Stodo. We have a place Koledziany in Eastern Galicia, and the Russian men's names Koleda and Koledinskii. Prudentius of Troyes, in the year 839, speaks of a campaign, "*contra Sorabos qui Colodizi vocantur*," thus identifying them unmistakably as Sorabians. The name appears in documents as Coledizi, Cholidici, Colidiki and Colidici; the town Colidici mentioned by Dithmar is the modern Kolditz on the Mulde, while their other town of Kesigesburgh, according to Leutsch, is Guetz or Quetz, near Landsberg. Pertz identifies it with Kothén (*id.*, 602). While the Colidici bordered on the Susali on the west, the latter were in contact on the east with the Sitizi, so called apparently from a town Citice on the Elbe, in the land of the Nizizi (*see* Spruner's map). The name occurs as Zitici, Cicitze, Citizi, Zitrici or Zittici, etc., and it may be compared with those of Ziticina in the land of the Wends, Zitomu, in Russia, etc., etc. (*id.*, 602). Sucha, Olesnik, Domië, etc., are named as towns of the Sitizi.

South of the small gau we have just described was that of the Khutizi or Skudici, situated west of the Dalameni, and the Siusli extending as far as the Saale, and watered by the Elster and the Mulde. The district is now known as the Mark of Merseburgh and contains the famous city of Dresden. Dithmar, in 892 and 970, speaks of it as Khutici. In a deed of Otho the Second of 974, it is called Khutizi, in another of Otho the Third, 997, also Khutizi. In one of Henry the Second of 1004, there is mention of a town of Khut, according to Leutsch, either Gotha or Gauth. In 1013 we have Gudici, in 1045 Guodizi. The town called Skudici by Dithmar is the modern Schkeuditz. In deeds of 1004 the Gau is called Sckeudiz and Schutizi; and in another of 1041 we have the form Zcudizi (Schafarik, ii, 605 and 606). The variation of name has led Leutsch to make two gaus out of it, but this view seems very improbable and is discarded by Schafarik and the author of Spruner's map. With this name may be compared the town of Shudy in Lithuania, two villages called Khutce in the district of Lublin and Zachutici in the government of Minsk.

The south-eastern part of the land of the Northern Serbs which lay east of the Saale, south of the Mark of Merseburgh, and was watered by the Upper Elster, formed a compact district known as the Mark of Zeitz, so named from the town of Zeitz (called Ciza and Cisa in mediæval documents). This district was known specifically as Serbsko, or the Serbian land. In documents of the year 800 it is called Sarowe, and is thus referred to: "Regio provincialis sita juxta Boemiam Sarowe nuncupata;" and again, "Provincia Sarowe dicta . . . quidam comes de Boemia nomine Thacolf contulit" (Schafarik, ii, 606, note 2). In a deed of 1040 we have mention of a gau Zurbā, and in 1136 of Swurbelant, which both refer to this district.

This land of the Serbs, or Mark of Zeitz, comprised several minor gaus, which are clearly marked on Spruner's excellent map ("Series of the German gaus," Number 4). These were respectively known as Weta, Weda, or Weitaha in the north-west corner, then bordering it on the east, Tukhurini, again further east on both banks of the Elster, Puonzowa, then Plisni on the Plisa or Pleitse; Zwentokowa or Zwikowa (Zwickau); Gera or Geraha (probably originally Gora); Strupenice; Orla, otherwise called Brisingau and Dobnawa.

Near this district Schafarik would place the three gaus of Werenofelda, Fergunna and Genewara, mentioned in the campaign of Charlemagne's son Charles against the Bohemians in 805 and 806 in the Chron. Moissiac., and he identifies two of these gaus with the Verizane and Fraganeo of the Bavarian geographer, the former of which contained 10 towns, and the latter 11. The exact situation of these gaus is not known.

Pertz would identify Werenofelda with a gau Weri on the right bank of the Elbe, opposite Magdeburg, Fergunna, with some district on the Eger in Bohemia, and Genewara as a corrupt form of Weri-Gau. Ledebur identifies Werenofelda with the land on the River Werra, Fergunna with Würgau on the road from the Fichtel Mountains to the River Eger, and Genewara with Kamoren or Gommern in the neighbourhood of Magdeburg. Lelewel connects the Verizane of the Bavarian geographer with the towns of Brisen and Brisnik on the Neitze in Lusatia. The name Fraganeo or Fergunna is perhaps the Gothic fairguni, Scandinavian fiörgyn, Anglo-Saxon firgen ("mons, regio montana") with which the Slavic Perun and Lithuanian Perkūnas are connected.

Besides the larger colonies of Slaves which we have described there were many smaller settlements of them west of the Elbe, which are very interesting as sporadic elements in the general population of Central Europe. The small colonies were the result of the wars of the Franks and other Germans with

their Bohemian and Sorabian neighbours, when a large number of prisoners were naturally carried off, who were planted as colonists in various districts. So great must have been the number of these, that, as is well known, a Slave came to mean in German, a person in a servile condition. As early as the year 740 we find Saint Boniface re-peopling the waste districts in the diocese of Wurzburg and of the monastery of Fulda with Slaves, and in 751 Pope Zacharias granted him permission to levy taxes on those who were still unbaptized (Schafarik, ii, 607). Thence we find that in the registers of Fulda, Slaves are mentioned among its dependents in the woody districts round the monastery, such as in Ludera, Luterembach, Summerde, Hagen, Vargelaha, Lupenzo, Nitharteshuson, Salzunga, Gerstungen, Cruciburg, Heringen, Sulaha, Ugesberc, Geysaha, Bezzingen, Biberaha, Nuenburc, Rora, Engelmarestat, Otricheshusen (Schann. Buchonia vetus. Schoettgen et Kreysig Diplom. i, 46-48, cited by Zeuss, 646).

The name Wend occurs elsewhere in this district; thus, in a deed of 958: "Winatsazen et in tribus villis Sclavorum et Eitenwiniden in pago Salagowe" (Schoettgen Diplom. i, 18). Vuinidoheheim, Winithoheim, and the phrase "in pago Grapfelda . . . in loco Vualahramesuuinida" occur in others (*see* Zeuss, 646). Of Slaves in the district of the Lower Hartz near Mansfeld we have mention in a deed of 973, in which there is the following interesting notice: "De possessionibus S. Bonifatii martyris præscriptus venerabilis abbas Vuerinharius pari mutuatione concambii dedit in jus et proprietatem S. Mauritii martyris quicquid in Frekenleba et Sekkensteti, Arneri, Lembeki et Faderesrod, Kerlingorod, Mannesecsfeld, Duddondorf, Rodonvualli, Menstedi, Purtin et Elesleiba aliusque villis, villarumque partibus, *quas Slavuvainicæ familiæ inhabitant* . . . visus est habere" (Schann Traditt. Fuld. 241; Zeuss, 647).

We also read in old deeds of a place called Ernesteswinideni in the Valley of the Aisch, of Wolfheresuuinidon in Thuringia, Nidarun Winida in Carinthia, Moinuwinida or Moinvuiniden and Nabauuinida in the Fichtel Mountains, and Adalhartsuiniden Gerhartiswindin and Kotzenwinden elsewhere; while on the Aisch there are still found Brodswinden, Ratzenwinden, Poppenwind, Reinhardswind, etc. (*Id.*, 646, note.)

West of the Saale we meet with the following Slavic names in a deed of 993:—Riedauizi, Drogolisci, Siabudisci, Osutiscie, Cedlisciani. In another of 937 we read: "In loci marca, quæ Smeon dicitur XII familiæ Sclavorum cum territoriis quas ipsi possident." In another of 955, "Villa Spileberg quæ etiam alio nomine Sibrouici dicitur, in marca quoque quæ Smeon nominatur sita." This Smeon is the town of Schmon near

Querfurt. These names are more numerous in the country of the Upper Main on the Rednitz and the Aisch, which district was called the Slave-land, and its inhabitants Wends of the Main and Rednitz.

Thus we read in a document of Louis the German, dated 864: "Qualiter . . . dominus Karolus . . . episcopis præcepisset, ut in terra Sclavorum, qui sedent inter Moinum et Radantium fluvios, qui vocantur Moinuvinidi et Ratanzuvinidi una cum comitibus qui super eosdem Slavos constituti erant, procurassent, ut inibi sicut in ceteris Christianorum locis ecclesiæ construerentur, quatenus ille populus noviter ad Christianitatem conversus habere potuisset, ubi et baptismum perciperet." They are called Moinuvinida and Radanzuvinida in the foundation charter of Arnulf, dated in 889. In a deed of 824 we read of the town of Thurpfilun near the bank of the Moin "in regione Slavorum." In another deed of 911 we read of a place called Fihuriot as belonging to the king "cum cæteris Slavienis oppidis illuc juste conspicientibus." In another of 796 we have the phrase "tertiam partem in Slavica in Heidu." In the Valley of the Aisch, after speaking of Hohenstat near the River Cisca (i.e., Eisga or Eisca), we are told that in the same Slavic region ("in eadem Slavorum regione") the towns of Tutenstete, Lonrestat, Wachenrode Sampach, together with their Slave inhabitants "simul cum inhabitantibus Slavica" were accustomed to pay annual dues to Fulda; similar dues were payable by 40 mansi of the Slaves living in the town of Medabah (Zeuss, 647-648).

But as Zeuss says, the Slavic element in this district must have been subordinate to the German or was soon absorbed by it, for the topography is Teutonic, Thurpfilun (= Durfilin, Dörflein, now Dörfleins); Fihuriot (Veehried, Viehreut, now Viret), and Heida, all on the Main near Bamberg are Teutonic names. The names in the Valley of the Aisch, as well as two words from that district preserved in a deed of 889, are German also.

These words have been discussed by Grimm (*Rechtsalterth.* 298), and occur in the following sentence: "Decimam tributiq̃ue de partibus orientalium Franchorum, vel de Slavica ad fiscum dominicum annuatim persolvere solebant quæ secundum illorum linguam steora vel ostarstuopha vocant" (Zeuss, 648).

The topography of the country immediately west of the Saale is a striking proof of the extent to which Slavic colonies had planted themselves there. Thus we find such Slavic names as Leugast (in old documents Lubegast), Schorgast, and Trebgast in the upper valleys of the Main, and probably also in the same

neighbourhood we have mention in a deed of 1024 of a villa *Slopece* in pago Ratenzgowe (now Schlop on the River Sclop) with which may be compared the Polish Slupce, near Gneissen; and again in a deed of 1055, a "vicus nomine Silewitze . . . situs in pago Ratenzgouue," now Selbitz on the same river.

On the Rodach we have Graiz (formerly Grodeze, Grodiz), which is the same name as Graiz on the River Elster, Redwitz, which is like similar names on the Saale; Zedlitz, which is like the Polish Scedlec and the Bohemian Cedlczany, derived from the Slavic siedati to settle, and equivalent to the Anglo-Saxon Saetan, and the German setzen; Schwurtitz, which is a palpable corruption of Servitza; Schmöltz, a similar corruption of Smolensk; Kups formerly Khubitz (Zeuss, 649, note). As to the remoter Slavic name in Franconia, Zeuss mentions Graiz, Mitvitz, and Mödlitz on the Steinach; Zedlitz and Kups (upper and lower) near Staffelstein, Scheslitz, Zwernitz, (originally probably Swerince, and to be compared with Schwerin) Kreussen (anciently Crusni and Khrusin), Oelsnits (upper and lower) derived from the Slavic olsza the elder, whence also the Oelnitzbach, near Berneck, Doberschitz, Döberein, Kulmain, the mountain Kulm, near Neustadt, and Dolnitz. (*Id.*, 650, note.)

It would seem that the greater part of Eastern Franconia, and the districts of Wunsiedel, Waldsassen, Tirschenreut, and Bernau, as well as the greater part of the land on the Naab, the Rednitz and the Upper Main about Baireuth, Bamberg, Würzburg, and Nürnberg was in the ninth and tenth century occupied by Slaves. A large number of these settlements belonged to the Poradnitzi or inhabitants of the Rednitz, of whom we read in the life of St. Emmaramus: "Tradidit cuidam Thuringo in finibus Parathanorum, ad id temporis crudelium paganorum." South of the sources of the Rednitz is a place called Wilzburgh, in Old German Wiltenburgh, perhaps derived from the Slavic Wiltzi. It was not till the twelfth century that the pagan Slaves in this district were converted, although it was numbered among the German gaus as early as 889 A.D. The see of Bamberg was founded in 1007, and the same year it was decreed at the Synod of Frankfort, "ut paganismus Sclavorum inibi (at Bamberg) destrueretur." In the acts of the Synod of Bamberg in 1058, we read: "Erat enim plebs hujus episcopii utpote ex maxima parte sclavonica." In 1111 we find Arnold, Bishop of Halberstadt, writing to Henry, Bishop of Bamberg: "Totam illam terram pæne silvam esse, Sclavos ibi habitare," etc.; and in old deeds of Bamberg, the Slaves are frequently mentioned, as in the following curious sentence: "Quædam mulier Gothelindis nomine, cum esset

libera, sicuti Sclavi solent esse . . . delegavit ad altare," etc. The dialect and costume, the appearance and customs of the people of the district betray their Slave origin (Schafarik, ii, 609).

In the north-western part of Bavaria, in the district known as the Nord gau, there is marked in one of Spruner's maps of the German gaus, a district of Culm. This is doubtless the same which Zeuss wrongly puts in Thuringia, and which is thus named in a deed of 966: "In villis et marchis subnotatis scilicet in pago *Culm* et in villa Culm-naha et in Urbah et in villa Bertlesrode" (Zeuss, *op. cit.*, 649). This Culm or Khulm is doubtless derived from the Slave Chulm or Chlm, a mountain. The name occurs also in the town of Culmbach on one of the upper streams of the Main. While Cranach, not far off on the Khremnitz, a feeder of the Rodach, is similarly derived in all probability from the Slavonic Chraniti mountains, as in the district of the Craina in north-western Bosnia. We thus find north-eastern Franconia thickly sown with Slavic names. If we cross its northern boundary into Thuringia, we shall meet with a gau called Winidon, no doubt named from the same people. Within its borders is marked on Spruner's map the settlement of Wolfhereswinidon.

If we advance further west and south, we shall find sporadic Slave names in various parts of Germany. A considerable colony of them also is found in Switzerland. This last colony is mentioned in old documents—in one with the phrase "homines qui vocantur Wiinde" (Actâ Murensia in Kopps Vindiciâ, Schafarik, ii, 609). Thence we get in Switzerland such names as Khunitz, Bumplitz, Czernek, Gradetz, Krimentza, Luc, Visoye, Grona, etc. It is also a very curious fact that the descendants of the people whom the Swiss call Huns, and who are settled in the Valley of Anniviers, six miles from Sitten in the canton of Wallis (*i.e.*, canton of the Welsh or foreigners), still use a corrupt Slavic dialect. They are popularly looked upon as descendants of Attila's Huns (Schafarik, ii, 609). Thus we find the Slaves widely scattered over the countries west of the Elbe. It is not meant that all these Slaves were of the Serbian stock. Of this we have no evidence, nor is it in fact probable, for the Huns and other invaders probably were followed by Slaves of other stocks, but there can be small doubt that the greater part of them were emigrants from the country east of the Elbe, where the nearest Slavic settlements were, and which, as I have shown, were Serbian. Let us now return once more to the east of the Elbe, and examine the country I have identified with White Croatia, which as I believe was largely conterminous with the well-known district of Lusatia

or Luzice. The people of Upper Lusatia call themselves Srbje or Serbians, and those of Lower Lusatia, Serske, another form of the same name (Zeuss, 642).

The gau Luzice, according to Schafarik, derives its name from "luh," a meadow or flat low ground (*op. cit.*, ii, 595), and according to Zeuss from "luzha" a bog. (*Op. cit.*, 645.)

This gau of Luzice answered nearly to the well-known modern district of Lower Lusatia, that is to the ecclesiastical districts of Dame, Schlieben, Luckau, Kirchhain (Kustkof), Kalau, Kottbus (Chotebuz, Khocebc), and Spremberg (Groddek). The name was afterwards extended much beyond these limits—as far as the Oder on the north and east, comprising the gaus of Slubjany, Lubusany, Zarowany, Trebowany, etc., and finally included the southern districts of the Milciani and Nishani or Nisseni. When it had reached these limits, Lusatia was created a Margraviate, and is a well-known name in mediæval history.

The original gau whence the name thus spread is first mentioned by the Bavarian geographer, who calls it Lunsizi, and tells us it contained 30 towns. In deeds of the reign of Otho the First, dated in 949 and 961, it is called Lusici; by Reginon in 963, Lunsinzani; by Widukind of Corbey in 963, Lusiki; by Dithmar in 963 and 1005, Liusizi, Luzici, and Luizizi. In deeds of 965 and 967 of the Emperor Otho the First, respectively Lusici and Lucizi; in one of Pope John the Thirteenth of 968, Luzici; others of Otho the Second of 973, Lusice; and of the Emperor Henry the Second in 1004, Lusici. Within it were the towns of Tribus or Trebac (German Drebkof) named in 1004, Luibocholi or Libehol, Mroscina, Grothisti or Grodzisce, Liubsi, Zlupisti, Gostewissi (*i.e.*, Kottbus), Dobraluh (beautiful meadow) mentioned in 1005, and Ciani in 1015, etc., etc. (Schafarik, ii, 596).

On the north-western edge of Lower Lusatia is the small town of Goltzen, which is called "Castrum Golzin" in a deed of 1301; a neighbouring stream is called the Goltze. These names explain the mention of a tribe called the Golensizi by the Bavarian geographer, among whom he says were five towns. The name may be compared with a castle in Russia called Golsany (*id.*, 596). North of the Luzici was the gau of Selpoli or Selpzli, called Selpzuli, in a deed of Otho the First, of the year 948. In others of 961 and 967, it is called Selpoli, etc., etc. A river flows through the district called the Schlubbe or Slube, whose name Schafarik connects with that of Selpoli. The true form of the tribal name, however, he makes to be Slubeani or Slubliani. Between the Slubeani and the Lusizi, on the Upper Spree and Neisse, was a small gau, called Nissa, mentioned as

early as the year 965 in a deed of Otho the First as Niciti, and by Dithmar in 1005 as Nice. (*Id.*)

North-east of the Slubliani or Selpoli were the Lubushani, the inhabitants of the town of Lubusha, the modern Lebus and its neighbourhood. This clan was called Liubuzzi, by Adam of Bremen, and Leubuzi, by Helmold. Their country, which was long subject to the Poles, was the seat of a bishopric (*id.*). The Lupoglani or Lupiani, called Lupiglaa by the Bavarian geographer, and owning, according to him, 30 towns, lived according to Lelewel on the river Lupa, a tributary of the Neisse; a tributary of the Elster bears the same name, while there is a river Lupof in Pomerania, and another called Lupogolowa in Russia; an Illyrian Castle and Lordship Lupoglava, the German Mehrenfels, and two Croatian villages, one in the district of Agram, and the other in that of Warasdin. This all goes to prove that the Lupoglani belonged to the eastern branch of the Slaves and were probably a section of the White Croats.

In the east of Lower Lusatia is the town of Sorau or Sarof, which gave its name to the gau of Zara, named as early as the time of Dithmar. It was bounded, according to Leutsch, on the west by the Spree and the Neisse; on the north by the Oder, on the east by the Bober, and on the south by the land of the Milciani. The town of Trebula or Triebel, in Lower Lusatia, probably gave their name to the Trebowani, mentioned in the foundation deed of the archbishopric of Prague, and by Cosmas, with the Chruati, the Boborani, or inhabitants of the Bober, and the Zlasane or Silesians (*id.*, 598), which last folk we shall consider in a future paper. South and south-west of these several gaus, which probably constituted White Croatia proper, we have two others, named respectively Milciani and Dalamensir, which were very closely connected, and form the modern province of Meissen. We will now turn to them. Immediately south of the gau of Lusitz were the Milciani, who occupied the country now forming the province of Upper Lusatia, between the Bohemian mountains and Lower Lusatia. They are first named by the Bavarian geographer, who calls them Milzani, and tells us their land contained 30 towns. They occur very often in the accounts of the war between the Germans and the Poles, under Boleslaf Chrobry. They are called Milzeni in 922; Milceni in 946; Milcini in 1000, and Milzieni in 1002, by Dithmar. Their country is called Miltzæ, in a deed of Prince Metschislaf in 991, Mizlavia and Milzavia, by Adelbold in 1002 and 1003; Milkeani and Milzania in 1003, in the *Chron. Saxo.*; Milznia in 1004, in the *Annal. Saxo.*; Milsa in a deed of 1071, and by Cosmas, in the foundation deed of the Prague arch-

bishopric in 1086, Milciani; in a document of 1131 the district is called Milesko; in a deed of 1144 it is called Miltze, in another of 1165 Milzana, etc. All these forms Schafarik derives from the Slavic Milcin, plural Milci, or from Milcanin, Milcenin, plural Milcané, Milcene, Milcko, or Milcka; and as I shall show presently derives them from the Lettish and Lithuanian Milzis or Milzins (Schafarik, ii, 599). The chief town within the gau was Budusan, the modern Bautzen (Zeuss, 645). The name of this gau occurs also in Dacia. Thus we read in the Bavarian geographer: "Isti sunt qui juxta eorum fines resident. Osterabtrezi (*i.e.*, the southern Obodriti), in qua civitates plusquam C sunt, Miloxi in qua civitates LXVII." They lived, probably, on the river Milkof, in Moldavia, and gave their name to a bishopric first mentioned between 1370 and 1462 (Schafarik, ii, 202-3). Not far from here, in the modern Bessarabia, is a village called Milceni. We also have a tribe of the same name, and called Mileggoi, by the Greeks in the Peloponnesus. (*Id.*, 228.)

Near neighbours of the Milciani were the Dalamensi. They perhaps formed a section of the Milciani, as the name by which they are known in the Chron. Moissiac., where they first occur in the year 805, is Demelchion, which Schafarik suggests may be "de Milcene." In the Annals of Fulda, in 865 and 880, they are called respectively, Dalmatæ and Dalmatii. Alfred the Great calls them Dalamensan, and the Bavarian geographer, Talaminzi. He says of them: "Juxta illos (Serbos) sunt quos vocant Talaminzi qui habent civitates xiiii." In a deed of 981 they are called Dalminize, and are given the alternative name of Zlomekia. Dithmar, in 908, calls them Delemenci, and also Glomazi, and Zlomizi, and he gives as the explanation, "Provincia quam nos teutonice Delemenci vocamus, Sclavi autem Glomaci appellant;" and in a document of Otho the Second, of 981, we read, "Dalminize seu Zlomkia." The Slavic form of the name survives in "Lom-matsch," no doubt formed from Glomaci. As a lake in this district was called Glomuzy, it is not improbable the tribe took its name from it—a name derived probably from the Polish "glom," flowing or fluid. It may be remarked that one of the old towns of the district was called Serebez, now Schrabitz, which is probably connected with the name Serb. Both the Milciani and Glomaci, whose joint country formed the Mark of Meissen, were closely connected in their history with the Bohemians.

There still remains for us to describe a small gau occupying both banks of the Upper Elbe under the Bohemian mountains and between the Milciani and Dalamensi. This was called Nissenen, a name which, like that of the gau of a similar name already mentioned, was derived from Niz, Nizina, lowland or

valley. It is called Niseni and Nisani in 984 and 1004, by Dithmar and Nisane in later documents. The name may be compared with that of the famous town of Nish and a river of the same name in Serbia and Bulgaria.

This completes our survey of the topography of the Northern Serbs, but we have still to deal with a very embarrassing fact. There is no mistake about the conclusion that is forced upon us by the evidence we have here adduced, and the historical evidence that we shall adduce presently, that these Northern Sorabians and Obodritans belonged to the Eastern division of the Slaves. But when we examine the linguistic evidence, we are met with a profound difficulty, which has embarrassed all inquirers in this field. The language of the Sorabians and other Polabian Slaves belongs not to the Eastern, but to the Western division of the Slaves. In this inquiry we have three sources of evidence, namely, the well-known remains of the Lusatian tongue, those of the Drewanian language, and the scanty list of names, etc., in use among the other Polabian Slaves, and preserved in the Latin Chronicles. The evidence of all three is practically the same. The Lusatian language, which falls into two well-marked dialects, is placed by the two excellent authorities, Dombrowski and Schafarik, between the Polish and the Bohemian; but inclining more in its deeper vowel, *o*, and its frequent sibilants for *d* and *t*, to the Polish, and not marked by the Bohemian nasals (Dombrowski, quoted by Schafarik, *op. cit.*, 618, note 1). The Upper Lusatian is more like Bohemian, and uses *h* for *j*; the Lower Lusatian, still spoken about Kottbus, is more like Polish, and retains the *g* (Zeuss, *op. cit.*, 645, note).

The modern Lusatians, as Schafarik says, are clearly descended from the ancient Sorabians and Milciani. That their language was altered by the short subjection they were under to the Poles and Bohemians is hardly probable, and the fragments of old Lusatian forms which survive in the chronicles are essentially the same as the modern language (Schafarik, ii, 618). The Drewanian language, which survived as a spoken tongue until the seventeenth century, and of which we have considerable remains, may perhaps be taken as a specimen of the old tongue of the Obodriti. Although it differs in some respects from the Lusatian, it belongs, nevertheless, essentially to the Western, and not to the Eastern division of Slave tongues. Of this, Schafarik has collected ample proofs, as also of the similar relationship of the topographical and onomastical words belonging to the various Polabian Slaves, which occur in the chronicles (*op. cit.*, ii, 619–624). The only explanation of this paradox which seems reasonable is either that the Sorabians and other Polabian

Slaves were a second invasion superimposed on a previous layer of Western Slaves which already occupied this area, or else that the common element which these Northern Serbs had with the Southern ones was not in the mass of the people, but in the upper strata, which, as I have shown reason for believing, were not of Slavic but of Hunnic blood, and that the common name covered not so much a homogeneous race, as a common caste of leaders belonging to one stock. This, however, can only be offered as a tentative conclusion.

Section II.

Having examined the topography of the Northern Serbs and their relatives the Obodriti, we may now try and track out as far as we can the earlier part of their history. In doing this we shall have to reconsider somewhat the view urged in the two former papers, on the authority chiefly of Schafarik.

That the Croats and Serbs were invited to settle within his borders by Heraclius, about the year 634-640, we have no reason to doubt. The question as to whence they came from is one, however, that admits of some controversy. The problem is a limited one. There is no disputing that they came from the land beyond the Carpathians, but the question remains whether they came from Gallicia or the country further west.

Now the migrations of races are marked by certain limiting circumstances; whole peoples do not migrate over impassable ranges of mountains, nor, except under very peculiar circumstances, do they cross deserts or wastes. The route followed by many emigrants has been consequently the same. In the present instance we are to some extent limited in our choice by the configuration of the country north of the Danube. When we first meet with the Serbs it is in the neighbourhood of Belgrade. It is with the Governor of Belgrade that they conferred about recrossing the Danube. Nor have we any traces of Serbians in Wallachia, except in its extreme western part. Now if the Southern Serbs had migrated from Gallicia, marched through the Bukovina and Moldavia, and rounding the eastern buttresses of Transylvania had then crossed Wallachia, and thus reached their present country, we should assuredly have expected them to leave some traces of their passage; and, further, they would in that case, in accepting the invitation of the Byzantine Emperor, have probably entered Bulgaria. But not only is this not the case, but we actually find that Bulgaria formerly stretched considerably more to the west than it does now, and that the Serbs have been pushing their way eastwards as well as south-

wards. To anyone who examines the problem as it ought to be examined, with the map before him, there cannot be much doubt that the route here mentioned was not that followed by the migrating Serbs.

Such an examination will make it very clear that the invaders came not from Wallachia, but from the great Pannonian plain. Let us turn our view there shortly. Opposite to Serbia, north of the Danube, we have a district once occupied by a section of the Obodriti. These Southern Obodriti are first mentioned by Eginhardt. On the destruction of the kingdom of the Avars by Charlemagne, peace was made between the Bulgarians and Franks, who by this destruction became close neighbours. But they were not many years before they quarrelled, and the cause of quarrel was that three Slavic tribes, who had been allies, and no doubt dependants of the Bulgarians, allied themselves with the Franks and entered their borders. These tribes were the *Obodriti*, the *Gudusciani*, and *Timociani*, the two latter tribes under their chief Bornas. This was in 818 (Eginhardt *Annales*, ad an.). These Obodriti were settled on the Danube, and gave its name to a large district or gau in Southern Hungary, known as Bacs-Bodrog, in Slavic Bodrocka stolice (Schafarik, ii, 208), so called probably from the indigenous name of the Obodriti, namely, Bodrizi. Schafarik suggests that a section of these Obodriti gave their name to Bodrok and the Bodrotschka, in the district of Zemplin. This was long ago suggested by D'Anville (Hampson's "Dissertation on Alfred's Orosius," 39), and has received the high sanction of Schafarik himself. This gau or Comitatus of Bacs Bodrog is bounded on the south and on the west roughly by the Danube, on the east by the Theiss, and on the north by the country of Pesth Solt. Schafarik, however, makes the Obodriti occupy a much wider district than the present country of Bacs Bodrog, and tells us they stretched from the junction of the Trave with the Danube, right across the Banat, and as far as the land of the Bulgarian Severani (*op. cit.*, ii, 208). These he makes their limits north of the Danube. South of that river he places them in that portion of Serbia which has only been Serbian in late mediæval times, and which is bounded on the west by the Serbian Morava, and on the east by the Timok. These limits are not improbable. They coincide north of the Danube with the Austrian province called Woiwodia, and south of the river with Eastern Serbia; the latter bounded on the north by the River Maros and the proper land of the Magyars; on the east by that of the Rumans of Transylvania; and on the west by the Serbians of Slavonia and Syrmia. Under the year 824, we read in Eginhardt's *Annals* that envoys went to Louis the Pious from the

Obodriti, who were called Prædenecenti, and who were neighbours of the Bulgarians, who dwelt in Dacia, near the Danube (Zeuss, 614). D'Anville suggests that this name still survives in a canton of the Banat of Temeswar, named Pardan (Hampson, *loc. cit.*). Schafarik and Zeuss agree in identifying the mediæval Branitschewo with this name. Branitschewo was a town and principality on the south of the Danube. This town was called Viminacium by the Romans, and was situated on either bank of the River Mlaw, where it falls into the Danube a little east of the Morava, and where ruins still remain, those on one bank being called Mlawy Branicewac and those on the other Rostolac (Schafarik, ii, 209; Zeuss, 615). In the German accounts of the Crusades in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, the district from Belgrade to Nish, where Branitschewo was situated, was styled Bulgaria or "Silva Bulgaria." On the conquest of Bulgaria by the Greeks in 1018, it fell into their power, and the town of Branitschewo is mentioned by Theophylactos of Achrd in 1081, and by Anna Commena in 1114. In the first part of the twelfth century the town was subject to Hungary, but soon reverted again to the Greeks. In 1154 it was again conquered by the Hungarians. In 1172 it was visited by Henry the Lion, on his journey to Palestine, etc. It is probable that it was incorporated with Serbia about 1189, when Sofia, Semlin, Schtip, Nish, etc., were conquered by Nemanja. The Tzar Asan tells us that in his time it belonged to Bulgaria, but in 1275, in the reign of King Dragutin, it was certainly Serbian, and is often named until the Turkish conquest of 1459. It was the seat of a bishopric, and is styled Ducatus in old Byzantine and Hungarian authors. Its name still survives in popular memory, as in the song, "Po Kucewu e po Branicewu," and the district of Posharezk is still called Branitschewo (Schafarik, ii, 210).

Let us now turn to the two tribes who are mentioned as having deserted the Bulgarians jointly with the Obodriti. These were called Gudusciani and Timociani. The former name is, according to Schafarik, the German form of the Slavic Kutshani, the inhabitants of Kucewo or Kucajewo, the district of the Kutshai Mountains, south-east of Branitschewo. Kuc, Kuca, Kucaj, Kucaja, Kyc or Kyca, mean mountains in the various Slavic tongues, and is perhaps the real meaning of Kauk in Caucasus. There is also a Gacko called Gutzika by Constantine Porphyrogenitus, in Croatia. The mountains and district of Kutshai, south-east of Branitschewo, are frequently mentioned in Serbian and Hungarian history in the twelfth to the fifteenth century; on these mountains was situated the village of Kucajn.

The Timociani, it is agreed by Schafarik, Zeuss, and others,

simply mean the inhabitants of the Timok, on the frontier of the modern Serbia and Bulgaria. All this district was in the ninth century a part of Bulgaria.

The River Morava has two head streams which bi-fork near Warwarin; one of these is called the Serbian Morawa, and the other the Bulgarian Morawa. The Serbian Morawa has a very large tributary named the Ibar. The district between the Ibar and the Bulgarian Morawa, and that on either side of the Morawa itself till it falls into the Danube, was only added to Serbia by the victories of the Zupan Nemanja, who reigned from 1159–1195. In this district the dialect still differs from that of Serbia, as in saying “ny” for “nas, nam,” etc. (Schafarik, 212, note 2). The inhabitants of the whole district were probably included with those of Western Woiwodia in the generic name of Obodriti. These Obodriti were no doubt of the same race as the Northern tribe, as I have previously argued, and like them were not only close neighbours, but also near relatives of the Serbians, and formed in fact but fractions of the same stock. The importance of these Southern Obodriti may be gathered from the fact that the Bavarian geographer, who calls them Oster-abtrezi, tells us they possessed more than 100 towns (Schafarik, *op. cit.*, ii, 208, note 3). We also find traces of the occupancy of Serbs proper, north of the Danube. A portion of the district of Little Wallachia was formerly known as the Banat of Krajova, and in earlier times as the Banatus Zevriensis (*see* Spruner’s maps, 75 and 89). In the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries this district was governed by a Ban of its own, who was at first subordinate to the Bulgarians, and later to the Hungarians. When Bela the Fourth of Hungary, at the instigation of the Pope, marched against the Bulgarians, he incorporated the Severian Land (“*terram Zemram, Zevram, or Zevrin*”) and created it a Bishopric. In 1237 he wished to make over this district (“*terra de Zevrino*”) to the Knights of St. John with the obligation of guarding it against the Tartars (Schafarik, ii, 203).

This arrangement was not carried out, and the district continued to be ruled by Hungarian Bans, some of whom are mentioned as early as the thirteenth century. Below the outfall of the Topolnitza into the Danube there is still a village called Kimpul Šewerinuli by the Wallachians. Not far off is the village of Sewirineſt on the Kossum, which retains traces of a Serbian colony. We thus find that the Serbs and Obodriti once occupied the country north of the Danube, from below the Iron Gates to the Save. West of this we know, as I showed in a former paper, that the Croats once occupied the land between the Save and the Drave, and the border land of Slavonia. All

this points to the conclusion that when the Croats and Serbs invaded the borders of the Eastern Empire they came in from the north. Now it is equally clear that this district north of the Danube was in classical times occupied by an entirely different people, while we have express testimony that the Croats and Serbs came from White Croatia and White Serbia in the north. Let us now follow them there. On turning in the direction of the Carpathians we find almost directly north of the district of Woiwodia, and separated from it by the Great Hungarian Plain, a district watered by a river *Bodrog*, a large tributary of the Theiss. This river flows through the Hungarian county of Zemplin, and gives its name to the district of Bodrotschka; a little further west again we have in the county of Torna, the Bodra, a tributary of the Sayo. We have in these names a very close relationship with the name Obodriti or Bodrizi. The name Zemplin is nearly connected with that of Semlin on the Danube; the county of Torna with the canton Torontal in the Banat, and the River Topla with the Toplitz, a tributary of the Bulgarian Morawa, and I have small doubt that the Obodriti came from this part of the Carpathians, and migrated along the Valley of the Theiss.

In regard to the Serbs it may be that they came in by the same route, or it may be, as is perhaps more probable, that they followed the valley of the Danube, and entered Central Europe through the gap of tolerably flat country that separates Bohemia from Hungary, and therefore from Silesia. The two races came respectively, according to Constantine Porphyrogenitus, from White Croatia and White Serbia. Let us now try and realise rather more closely the meaning which the historian-emperor attached to these names. Speaking of the Croats before their advent on the borders of the empire he says they then lived beyond Bagibaria, where *are now* the Belo Chrobati; again he says: "The rest of the Chrobati dwelt towards Francia (*i.e.*, the land of the Franks) *and are called to this day* Belo Chrobati, or White Chrobati, and are subject to their own princes. They are, however, dependent on Otho the Great, King of Francia and Saxonia, and having been baptized they are in close alliance with the Turci" (*i.e.*, the Hungarians). Again, in another place he says: "The Chrobati who live in Dalmatia are derived from the baptized Chrobati who are called White, who live beyond Turcia (*i.e.*, Hungary), near to Francia, and are near the unbaptized Serbian Slaves" (Stritter, ii, 389 and 390). Constantine reigned from the year 945 to the year 959, and was a contemporary of Otho the Great. As we shall see presently, Otho the Great and his predecessor, Henry the Fowler, had after continuous fights with their Slavic neighbours entirely

subdued them. The bishoprics of Oldenburg, Havelberg, and Brandenburg were founded to convert them. The Slaves were everywhere subdued and converted to Christianity. They, however, retained their own princes, who were afterwards created margraves, and we may compare with Constantine's statement those of Widukind and the other German contemporary writers. "Baptizatus est totus populus. . . . Slavonia in XX pagos dispersita . . . pax fuit continua; Slavi sub tributo servierunt" (Schafarik, ii, 530, note 4).

Bagibaria or Bavaria then stretched eastwards as far as the Danube (*id.*, ii, 244), so that we can to some extent limit the problem of finding White Croatia. It was beyond Bavaria; it was included in the districts subdued and Christianized by the Saxon emperors; and it was beyond Hungary. In his translation of the history of Orosius, Alfred the Great, who wrote about half a century before Constantine, tells us that east of the Dalamensan lived the Horithi. Horithi has been generally accepted as a form of Croat. In the foundation charter of the bishopric of Prague there is mention made of two Chrovati, doubtless meaning two gaus of the name, as follows: "Novum antiquo fere ejusdem tenoris addit privilegium . . . primitiva illa parochia cum omni terminorum suorum ambitu . . . ad aquilonalem hii sunt termini: Psovane, Chrovati et altera Chrovati, Zlasane, Trebovane, etc." (Schafarik, ii, 444, note 2). I have already discussed these names. I am disposed to identify the White Croatia of Constantine and the Horithi of Alfred with Lusatia in its wider sense, and with Silesia. It is in conformity with this view that we actually find the people of these two districts called Serbs. Two villages on the Saale bear the name of Kerbetha, no doubt derived from these Northern Croats. The northern one, near Halle, is mentioned by Dithmar as Chruuati. The southern one, on the White Mountain, is named in the Chronicle of Halberstadt, published by Leibnitz, in the phrase, "ad transitum Salæ in Curewate" (Zeuss, 608). So much for the situation of the Northern Croats.

Let us now examine their history more closely. It is generally supposed that the Croats and Serbs were summoned by Heraclius from the north of the Carpathians, but this is not only very improbable in itself—for it is hardly likely that an Emperor of Byzantium should have had direct intercourse with those regions—but it is not so stated by Constantine. He says of the Croats that, headed by five brothers, they left their own people and came to Dalmatia where they fought with the Avars, etc. (Stritter, ii, 389); and in another place he says, "they fled to the Emperor Heraclius before the Serbi fled to him" (*id.* 393); and again of the Serbians he tells us how a strife

having arisen between two sons of their king, one of them with his people fled to the Roman Emperor Heraclius" (*id.*, 151). It was after they had arrived on his borders that he incited the Croats to attack and drive out the Avars, and gave them their land (*id.*, 394). We must therefore consider them as fugitives from their own country. I may add that one branch of the Croats, together with the kindred tribes of the Stoderani and the Suselzi, made their way to Carinthia and occupied a district on the Mur between the towns of Knittelfeld and Leoben, where a place called Kraubat still recalls their name. The district they occupied was known in the middle ages as the "Pagus Crauati," and is so called in a deed of Henry the First,* dated in 954. In another of Otho the Second of 978, it is called Chrouat, and in a Salzburg deed of the eleventh century we read of "prædiae . . . Chrouata et Runa" (Schafarik, ii, 337, note 5). Near the village of Windischgarsten, in the mountain range separating Steiermark and Upper Austria, we have a place called Hither and Further Stoder, while in the Krainian Alps, near Terglu, is a valley of Stoder, doubtless so called from the Stoderani. In Salzburg documents of 970 and 1045, we read of a wood called Susil or Sausal, situated on the River Lonsnitz in Lower Steiermark, a district still called Sausal; we also have a place called Ziusila, probably a corruption of Zuisila on the River Ipusa in Austria. These names are doubtless connected with the Syssele whom we have already described. (*Id.*, 337 and 338.)

I would remark that the Croats at present living in Moravia, in the territory of Lundenburg, and in Austria in the districts of Walcziz and Rabensburg, are emigrants from the Trans-Danubian Croatia, who first settled in their present quarters in the last century. (*Id.*, 500.)

We must therefore look upon the Northern Serbs at the beginning of the seventh century as occupying a continuous area from the Elbe along the northern borders of Bohemia and Hungary to the Pruth. What took place in Silesia and Lusatia took place in another district. It would seem to be almost certain that at the same period a similar series of Slavic tribes occupied the country between the Elbe and the Oder from Dresden to the sea, tribes closely related, and Serbian in blood. As the Poles made a gap in the continuity of the Serbs in Silesia, so a Polish race, the Wiltzi, found its way westwards to the middle Elbe, and thrust back this early Serbian colony until it consisted eventually but of a narrow strip along the right bank of the river with a large mass at its northern end

* This must be meant for Otho the First, or the Great, 936-973. Henry the Fowler reigned 918-936.

forming the northern Obodritan kingdom; so that it would appear that at this date the Polish stock was bounded and cushioned round on the west and south by a layer of Serbian tribes which separated it on the one hand from the Germans, and on the other from the mixed races of Bohemia and Pannonia.

Our next inquiry is to discover whether this wide and continuous area had been occupied by Serbs from a very early date. We shall have no difficulty in concluding that in its western part at all events this was not so, but that the Serbs here were intruders.

There can be no doubt that the various Slavic tribes who occupied the right bank of the Elbe in the time of Charlemagne were intruders there, and were not indigenous. The classical writers have left us ample details about this district, but nowhere do the chief Slavic divisions, nor those of their constituent tribes, occur in their pages. This area they describe as in part occupied by a very different race—by Lombards, and Varini, and Angles, and Vandals, and Marcomians—all no doubt Teutonic tribes belonging to the great Swevic or Suabian stock, and these writers enable us to trace the migration of these various tribes from this their motherland.

It was only after they had migrated that these Slaves came in, the most westerly Slaves before the migration having been the Wiltzi, who in the time of Ptolemy lived on the Oder. At that time, therefore, the Germans were in immediate contact with tribes of the Polish stock. The intruders as I have said belonged to the eastern section of the Slaves, and not to the Polish section, and were at constant feud with the older Slavic occupants of the Oder, which is in itself tolerable evidence that they were intrusive strangers. Whence did they come? Clearly not from the west, which was a purely German area, nor from the north, which was Scandinavian, nor from the east, which was occupied by their mortal enemies the Wiltzi and other Polish Slaves. There remains, therefore, but the south, and I have no hesitation in saying they followed the course of the Elbe.

The next question is, When these Slaves invaded the Valley of the Elbe? This is complicated with another element. I have already suggested in the previous paper of this series that the Serbs were led by a caste of a foreign race, probably Hunnic or Alanic, and I remitted the consideration of the question to a future paper. We may now devote a short time to it. It is a very remarkable fact, *in limine*, that the Serbian dialect should have several words in it of Finnic origin as: Finnic, *suggo*, *suggu* (genus, cognatio), Serb, *sukun*—*djed* (atavus), *sukun*—*baba* (atavia). Finnic *katk* (pestis), Serb *kuga*, Polabian *koghe*, in

the Mecklenburg dialect koghe. Finnic pehle (anas, dom), Serb pile (pullus gall). Finnic pahhast (pravus), palhareet (diabolus), Serb pakostan pakost, etc. etc. (Schafarik, ii, 246 and 247.) It seems to me that this Finnic element can have no other origin than from the Huns, who probably led the race.

Again, it has almost universally been held that the name Croat is derived from Khrebet, a mountain chain, and is connected with that of Carpathian, and this was the view which, following Schafarik and others, I adopted in my paper on the Croats, but I am by no means so well assured of this view now. The name, if it were even a merely geographical one, would apply equally well to the Slovaks and the Northern Serbs as to the Croats; and it does not seem probable that one out of a series of mountain tribes should call itself "mountaineers;" on the other hand that a tribe should call itself from some noted leader is a very common occurrence, and the name Chrobat was certainly used as a personal name. One of the five brothers who led the Croats southwards was so called; but, what is much more important, the first great chief of the Bulgarians, who were Huns under another name, was called Chrobat, and it was under his sons that the Bulgarians separated into various sections and were scattered. It would seem, therefore, that Chrobat was a Hunnic name, and it is not improbable that the Croats were so called from some Hunnic chief named Chrobat. The names Bodrog, Ceadrag, Anatrog, etc., chieftains of the Polabian Slaves, have a very Bulgarian and Hunnic appearance. The name Derwan, which occurs as that of a Sorabian chief, in 630 is according to Schafarik not Slavic (*op. cit.*, ii, 513), and may be Hunnic. I may add, however, that Zeuss compares it with the Slavic name Derewliani, a well-known Russian tribe mentioned by Nestor, and the Derbleninoi of Constantine Porphyrogenitus, both names having an "l" in their composition like the forms Serbli or Sorabli of Serb (*op. cit.*, 643). Beda calls the Slaves Huns, which the Saxon, Danish, and Scandinavian writers frequently do, and which is doubtless to be explained by the fact that the Slaves were generally the subjects of the Huns. He tells us that the priest Egbert converted the Frissones, Rugini, Dani, Huni, old Saxons, and Boruchtuarii, that is the various tribes of Northern Germany. Here, as Schafarik argues, the mention of the Huns with the other tribes shows that by them the Slaves are meant, since there were no Huns proper in Northern Germany.

I would explain in this way a curious statement of Adam of Bremen, who in describing the marriage of the Slave chief Meshnoi with the niece of Duke Bernard, calls him a dog. Now the German for dog is hund, which is very like Hun.

Thus we understand Helmold when he says, "Saxonum voce, Slavi canes vocantur." This is like the old chronicler who calls the Great *Khan* of Tartary, *Magnus Canis* or the Great Dog.

Again, there is a tribe of Serbs whose name occurs in various districts, which is interesting in this discussion. This is the tribe of the Syssele or Siusli to which I have already referred. It has been argued that the name of this tribe is the same as that called Szekelyek or Szekely by the Hungarians, the well-known Seklers of Transylvania. This tribe, which speaks the Hungarian language, is essentially a part of the Hungarian nation. It occurs in mediæval history under the form Siculi. The Siculi are considered by the Hungarian chroniclers to be descendants of Attila's Huns; thus the notary of King Bala writes of them: "Siculi qui primo erant populi Athelæ regis (Zeuss, 756), tria millia virorum, eadem de natione (Hunorum), . . . metuentes ad Erdewelwe confinia videlicet et Pannonicæ regiones se transtulere, et non Hunos sive Hungaros, sed in illorum agnoscerentur esse residui, Siculos, ipsorum autem vocabulo Zekel, se denominasse perhibentur. Hi Siculi Hunorum prima fronte in Pannoniam intrantium etiam hac nostra tempestate residui esse dubitantur per neminem cum in ipsorum generatione, extraneo nondum permixta sanguine, et in moribus severiores et in divisione agri ceteris Hungaris multum differe videantur" (Throrocz ap Schwantn, 78; Zeuss, 756). Simon Keza calls them Zaculi, *i.e.*, Sakuli, and Schafarik connects with this form of the word, the Serbian names of Sekula and Sekulit (Schafarik, ii, 204). It seems exceedingly probable that these Szekely gave their name to the Syssele or Siusli, who are found so widely scattered from Wend Syssel in the north of Denmark to Susola in Russia, and if so we have another piece of evidence to show that the Serbs were led by a caste of Huns. Again, it is very curious that the Western Slaves should be so often referred to as Huns. I have pointed out that those settled in the Swiss valleys are so called, but what is more important in our present discussion is that the Slaves of the Elbe were actually known as Huns (Schafarik, 512). And it was probably from this fact that we meet with the name Hun so frequently in the folklore of Germany and the Norse countries. I hope to revert to this question when we come to deal with the Pannonian Slaves in a future paper. Meanwhile, I would urge that the Northern Serbs and Croats occupied the Valley of the Elbe under the leadership of Huns or Avars. When the flat country east of that river was abandoned by the various Teutonic tribes of Lombards, Angles, Varini, and by the Vandals, these Slaves who had been conquered by the Huns migrated into the vacant lands, and thus occupied them. This was probably

during the sixth century after Christ. They thus thrust themselves in between the Poles and the Germans, and their country became a veritable Mark or March, a name which was in fact applied to several of its districts, as Ukermark, the Mark of Brandenburg, etc. Let us now collect the scattered fragments of their history which have survived, and begin with the Obodriti.

The Obodriti first appear in history in the pages of the Frankish chroniclers of the eighth century. Charlemagne was brought into contact with them in his Saxon wars, and we are told that in 780, after the fierce struggle with the Saxons which had lasted since 772, he went to where the Ohre falls into the Elbe, where he arranged the affairs of the Saxons and of the Slaves beyond the Elbe (Eginhardt Annals, Pertz, i, 160). The *Annales Lauresh.* say that in this year a great number of Winidi were converted to the faith (Pertz, i, 31). By these Slaves and Wends no doubt the Obodriti are meant, and the *Chron. Mur.* expressly says the Obodriti were converted in this year (Schafarik, ii, 577, note 1).

In 789 Charlemagne was once more in this district, and marched to subdue the Wiltzi. He had to traverse the country of the Obodriti, who were no doubt his allies (*Ann. Lauresh.* Pertz, i, 34; *Ann. Lauris.*, *id.*, 119 and 174; and Eginhardt's, *id.*, 175). The Wiltzi were subdued and made tributary, and gave hostages. On this occasion the Suurbi and the Obodriti, whose prince was Witzan, were in alliance with him (*Ann. Lauris.* Pertz, i, 174). When in 793 Karl was absent on his Spanish campaign, the Saxons again broke out into revolt. During this strife it seems that Wiltzan or Witzan, the chief of the Obodriti, went across the Elbe, probably to assist the Frank kaizer, when he was waylaid in an ambush by the Saxons in the town of Hliuni, *i.e.*, Lune, near Luneburgh, close to the Elbe, and was killed by them (*Ann. Lauresh.* Pertz, i, 36; Eginhardt, *id.*, 181).

Charles, who in 795 was at Bardenwik, near Luneburgh, ravaged the country of the Saxons, who had thus killed his ally. They were apparently the Trans-Albingians (*Ann. Lauresh.* Pertz, i, 37). In 798, we are told in the annals last cited, that "our Slaves, who are called Obodriti, united themselves with the Frank Emperor's 'Missi,' and marched against the Trans-Albingian Saxons, whom they defeated in a fight, in which the Saxons lost 2,901 men. After their victory they went to Charles in Thuringia, who lauded them for what they had done" (Pertz, i, 37). The *Annals of Eginhardt* say that the Saxons were the aggressors, adding the phrase, "for the Obodriti were always the allies of the Franks." The chief of the Obodriti on this occasion,

we are told, was Thrasco or Drasco, and the fight took place at Suentana (*i.e.*, Swante in the district of Schwan on the Warnof). This author says 4,000 of the Saxons fell, as was reported by Eburis, who was present at the fight. Being thus beaten they returned home again (Eginhardt, Pertz, i, 185). The following year the emperor sent his son Charles to settle the matters of the Wiltzi and the Obodriti, that is doubtless to create a better feeling between those tribes (Eginhardt, *id.*, 187). In 804, the Emperor, weary with the constant outbreaks of the Trans-Albingian Saxons, determined to transplant them within his own borders. We are told by Eginhardt that he so transplanted all the Saxons living beyond the Elbe, and those living in Wigmodia, south of that river, and gave their land to the Obodriti (Pertz, i, 191-2). The Chron. Moissiac. says that Charles, having gone to Oldonostath, *i.e.*, Oldstede on the Alster, sent his troops, which transported all the Saxons in the districts of Wigmodia, Hosingabi, and Rosagabi, as well as those living beyond the Elbe (Pertz, i, 307). Wigmodia was so called from the River Wimme, and Hosingabi from the River Oste; they were large districts on the left bank of the Lower Elbe, comprised in the diocese of Bremen. Rosogavi was apparently situated in the same district and also on the left bank of the Elbe. Kruse argues that the castle and monastery of Rosenfeld near Stade derive their name from it (Chron. Norm., 39). He also argues against the likelihood of a transportation from the districts south of the Elbe, but I confess the statements of Eginhardt and of the Chron. Moissiac, which at this particular date are of singular weight and authority, seem to me to be overwhelming, and that it is probable that by this transportation, Holstein, with a large part of the district between the Lower Weser and the Lower Elbe, were denuded of their Saxon population altogether, and given over to the Obodriti. This is partially confirmed in other ways: thus the name of the Duchy of Lauenburgh is apparently connected with the Linai, and of this district we have a curious mention in Eginhardt's Annals under the year 822, where we are told that by order of the emperor the Saxons built a fortress across the Elbe at Delbende. *The Slaves who lived there and occupied it previously were driven away*, and a Saxon garrison put there against their incursions (Pertz, i, 209). The Delvunda, adds Pertz, is the modern Stecknitz in the Duchy of Lauenburg. He argues that the fortress so built was situated near Mollen, and that from this plantation the district from Mollen to the Elbe received the name of "der Sachsenwald," which it bears to this day (*id.*). In a paper on the Saxons of Old Saxony, which I had the honour of reading before the Society, I argued from other considerations that the present inhabitants of Holstein are descended

from immigrants from Saxony south of the Elbe, and not from the old indigenous Saxons of the district. This all goes to show that the people of Trans-Albingia were in fact transported bodily by Charlemagne, and for a time at least their lands occupied by the Obodriti. The same year in which this transportation took place various Slavic chiefs came to the Emperor at Holdanstadt, asking him to settle their differences. He appointed Thrasco as their head (*Chron. Moissiac. Pertz*, i, 307; *Ann. Laur., id.*, i, 191; *Ann. Metenses*; *Kruse*, 41). To prevent further mischief, it would seem from the capitularies that Charlemagne forbade the merchants from selling weapons to the Slaves. He also appointed governors to their frontier towns. The institution of Margraves or Marquises did not take place till a later date (*Schafarik*, ii, 519, note).

In 808, the famous Danish King Godfred marched against the Obodriti. He captured several of their fortresses. Drasco was driven away, and Godelaib, another chief, captured by stealth, was hanged; and both divisions of the Obodriti were made tributary to the Danes. Godfred did not win his way without serious loss. We are told several of his principal people were killed, as well as Reginold, his brother's son. Charlemagne, meanwhile, despatched his son Charles across the Elbe against the Linones and Smeldingi, who had sided with the Danes, and having punished them, he returned across the river. The Danes were joined by the Wiltzi who, we are told, on account of their ancient feuds with the Obodriti, had of their own accord joined the Danes, and returned home safely with a large booty. Godfred destroyed Reric, the chief emporium of the Obodriti, exacted a large tribute from it, and carried off its merchants (*Eginhardt*; *Pertz*, i, 195; *Chron. Moiss., id.*, 258). The Emperor ordered two fortresses to be built on the Elbe to overawe the Slaves. It was from this Reric that the Obodriti were also called Reregi, "*Obodriti qui nunc Reregi vocantur*," as Adam of Bremen says.

In 809 Thrasco, who had had to give his son as a hostage to Godfred, having been joined by some Saxons, wasted the lands of his neighbours the Wiltzi, and returned home with a large booty; and afterwards again, with the help of the Saxons, marched against the Smeldingi, who had gone over to the Danes, as I have mentioned, and captured their chief town of Connoburg, but shortly after he was killed by the Danes by treachery at Reric (*Eginhardt Annals*, *Pertz* i, 196–197; *Chron. Moiss., Pertz* i, 309; *id.*, ii, 258).

In 810, the fortress of Hohbuokhi on the Elbe, no doubt in the country of the Linones, was captured by the Wiltzi (*Eginhardt Annals*, i, 197–198). The following year the Emperor sent

his son Charles across the river, who wasted the lands of the Lanai or Linones and Bethenici, and rebuilt Hohbuokhi (Chron. Moiss., Pertz, i, 309). In 814 Charlemagne died. His biographer, Eginhardt, says: "the old hero had made tributary all the tribes between the Rhine and the Vistula: the Welatabi or Wiltzi, Sorabi, Obodriti, and Boemanni." Schafarik thinks this an exaggeration, but I confess it seems in unison with the statements of the Chroniclers. It does not mean that these tribes ceased to be governed by their own chiefs, but that they were dependent and tributary on the great Kaizer. In the year 815, Harald, the Danish King, the *protégé* of the Frank Emperor, returned home, and we are told the Saxons and Obodriti were ordered to march to assist him, and they accordingly advanced beyond the Eider, and having ravaged the country, retired again (Eginhardt Annals, Pertz, i, 202). During the same year, Louis held a convention at Paderborn, where envoys went to him from all the Eastern Slaves (*id.*). In 817 a fresh disturbance arose among the Obodriti. We are told that after the death of Thrasco, Slaomir, who had succeeded him, and who was probably his brother, was ordered by the Franks to divide his heritage with Ceadrag, Thrasco's son. This annoyed him so much that he declared he would never cross the Elbe again, nor repair to the Imperial palace. On the other hand, he sent envoys to the sons of Godfred, the Danish King, who were at issue with the Franks, and asked them to send an army into Saxony beyond the Elbe.

They accordingly went and laid waste the country on the banks of the Stur, while the Obodriti repaired to Esesfelth and attacked it; but the place being bravely defended, they retired (Eginhardt Annals, i, 203-4). The next year Slaomir was captured, and was taken to the Emperor at Aachen by the prefects of the Saxon March and the legates. Being accused of many crimes by the Obodritan chiefs, he was exiled, and Ceadrag was given the kingdom (*id.*, Pertz, i, 205). In 821 Ceadrag having proved unfaithful and having entered into some conspiracy with the Danish princes, the sons of Godfred, Slaomir was sent back again, but when he arrived in Saxony he fell ill, and having been baptized, died (*id.*, Pertz, i, 207-208). The following year the Emperor held a convention at Frankfort, where all the Eastern Slaves, *i.e.*, the Obodriti, Sorabi, Wiltzi, Beheimi, Marvani, Prædenecenti, and the Avars of Pannonia, sent envoys with presents (Eginhardt Annals, Pertz, i, 209). In the spring of 823, the annual May meeting took place at Frankfort, and Ceadrag was there accused of treachery; messengers were sent to him and he accordingly sent some envoys to make his peace with the Emperor, and promised to go in person in the

autumn. The autumn meeting was held at Compiègne, and Ceadrag with some of his people went there as he had promised. He was reproved, but on account of his parents' good character was allowed to return again (*id.*, 211). In 828 fresh complaints were made against Ceadrag at the Imperial May meeting at Ingelheim. He was ordered to appear at the October meeting and having gone there was detained. Meanwhile, messengers were sent to inquire among the Obodriti whether they wished to have him back or not. They reported that opinion was divided on this question, but that the more respectable and important chiefs wished him to go back. He was accordingly sent back again. (*Id.*, 215.)

During the strife between Louis and his sons, the Slaves were apparently unmolested by the Franks, and we do not meet with them in the Annalists for some years. In 839 a Saxon army was sent against the Linones who had fallen away from their allegiance, while another was sent against the Wiltzi and Sorabians (Schafarik, ii, 522). By the Treaty of Verdun, made in 843, the Polabian Slaves fell to Louis the German. This was apparently deemed a good opportunity for revolt, and we are told the Obodriti accordingly rebelled in 844, but they were repressed, and their leader Gotzomysl was killed (*id.*, 523). In 845 Slavic envoys went to Louis at Paderborn. The defeat just mentioned seems to have pacified the Obodriti for a few years, and it was not till 858 that Louis sent his son Louis against the Obodriti and Linones.

In 862 Louis himself led an army against the Obodriti, and compelled their chief Dabomysl (Schafarik suggests Daba, Dabisa, or Dabizif) to submit and give up his son and others as hostages (Fulda, "Annals," *id.*, 374). Hincmar says the expedition was not successful, and that Louis returned to Frankfort after losing several of his principal men (*id.*, 458). Louis the Second, about the year 877, exacted tribute from the Linones and Siusli (Schafarik, ii, 524). We do not read of the Obodriti again till 889, when Arnulph, the famous German king, marched against them. The expedition was not successful, and the army returned after effecting nothing (Fulda, "Annals;" Pertz, i, 406-7). The Obodriti apparently now regained their freedom and remained independent till the time of Henry the First (Schafarik, ii, 525). It was probably in the year 927 when they were again subdued, and we find them named by Widukind with the Wiltzi, Hevelli and Redarii as made tributary by Henry (Schafarik, ii, 523, note 4). Some time after, Henry punished the Danes severely, and created a Margraviate of Schleswig. This so terrified the Obodriti that they at length, about the year 932, consented to become

Christians (*id.*, 527). Henry died in 936, and was succeeded by his son Otho the Great, who determined to overcome the Polabian Slaves with the sword and the Cross. The campaign began unluckily in 939 with an attack made by the Obodriti on the German Margrave, whose army was defeated and he himself killed. The Annalist gives a singularly graphic description of the Obodriti, which I will quote in the original :—

“Illi (*i.e.*, the Obodriti) vero nihilominus bellum quam pacem elegerunt, omnem miseriam caræ libertati postponentes. Est namque hujusmodi genus hominum durum et laboris patiens, victu levissimo assuetum, et quod nostris gravi onere esse solet, Scavi pro quadam voluptæ deducunt” (Widukind, ii ; Schafarik, ii, 528, note 1).

The Margrave Gero, to revenge the defeat just named, invited thirty Slave chiefs to a banquet, where all except one, who accidentally escaped, were murdered. This horrible crime led the Stodorani to take up arms. They were joined by the other Slavic tribes, and the Germans were driven beyond the Elbe. When Otho heard of this, he hastened to Magdeburgh ; but the crafty Gero had already pacified the storm. He had won over by presents and promises Tugumir, a Slavic prince who was well disposed towards the Germans, and who had been baptized, to betray his own countrymen. He returned home and pretended to have broken with the Germans, and was believed by his people, who made him their chief. He then took the opportunity to kill his nephew, the prince who had escaped when the other twenty-nine were massacred, and declared his country to be subject to the German king. This was followed by the unwilling submission of the Obodriti and Wiltzi (Schafarik, ii, 528). During the 14 years that followed, Otho founded the bishoprics of Oldenburgh (Stargard) in Wagrien, Havelberg (in 946), and Brandenburg (in 949) for the conversion of the Slaves. This policy was not immediately successful. During the absence of Otho and of Gero, the Ukrani took up arms. This was in 954. The revolt was speedily quelled by Gero, and the Duke Conrad. Next year the rebellious Saxon Counts, Wichman and Egbert, were driven out of Saxony by Hermann Billung. They fled to the Obodritan princes Nakon and Stoinegin, who were unfriendly to the Germans, and who were in the town of Swetlastrana, whose site is not known. They persuaded them to oppose the Saxon duke Hermann. The latter retired from Swetlastrana after a slight skirmish, and even agreed to surrender Kokareszem to the enemy. As the Germans were retiring from the town, a brawl arose between them and the Slaves, in which the latter, unmindful of the agreement, killed several of them, and carried off the women

and children. Otho marched in all haste to the rescue with his son Liutolf and the Margrave Gero. Meanwhile, the Obodriti, Wiltzi, Chrepienyani, Dolenzi, and Redarii had banded themselves together under the command of Stoinnegin. Pourparlers ensued. The Obodriti were willing to pay tribute, but objected to the Germans mixing in their internal affairs, to their land being divided out into German "gaus," and to German officers being appointed as counts of the "gaus," but Otho was inexorable, and a bloody battle was accordingly fought on the River Dosa, in which the Slaves were defeated. Stoinnegin and a great number of Slaves fell in the battle, and Wichman and Egbert went to King Hugh in France.

In this battle the Rani, or people of Rugen, sided with the Germans. Otho again fought with the Redarii in 957, and as Wichman afterwards took refuge with the latter and the Stodorani, the war lasted till 980. The Slaves at length consented to be baptized, and to have churches and monasteries built among them. They retained their own princes, but the land was divided into gaus, and Margraves were appointed as overseers, who had a joint authority with the princes (Schafarik, ii, 529-530).

On the death of the Margrave Gero, in 965, fresh disturbances arose on the frontier. The Saxon Duke Hermann Billung having interfered as arbitrator in a quarrel between the Obodritan chief Mestiivi (? Mctislaf) and Zelibor, Prince of the Wagrians, and decided against the latter, he took up arms and persuaded Wichman to join him. He was besieged in his capital, however, made prisoner and foiled. Wichman fled to the Wolini, at the mouth of the Oder, began a struggle with the Poles, and there lost his life in 967.

Under Otho the Second the strivings of the Slaves after independence were kept alive by the tyrannical conduct of the Margraves. In 976 the Emperor had to march in person against the Wiltzi, but without much effect. The same cause tended to retard the spread of Christianity. This was especially the case among the Obodriti, where although the old Prince Mestivoi was a Christian, and had in 973 married the sister of Wago, Bishop of Stargard, yet incited by his son Michislaf who was inclined to Heathenism, and by his own inclination, he put away his wife, plundered the property of his brother-in-law the bishop, and persecuted the Christians. Mestivoi is called Billung by Helmold. He took this name on his baptism, being so called after the Saxon Duke Hermann Billung (Schafarik, ii, 531, and note 7).

On the news of the Frankish defeat at Basentella reaching the Slaves, they broke out into revolt. The avarice and cruelty

of the Margrave Theoderic are stigmatized by the Chroniclers as a chief cause of their disaffection. In 983 the Obodriti marched on Hamburg, and the Wiltzi on Havelberg and Brandenburg. They burnt the churches and bishops' dwellings there, and killed or drove out the Germans, and even threatened Saxony.

In 996 Otho the Third agreed to a truce with the Obodriti and Wiltzi, by which the former bound themselves to adopt Christianity. So great was the opposition to this faith, which was doubtless then very Erastian, that the Obodriti had driven out their chief Mestivoi, because he was a Christian. By the treaty this Slavic tribe secured its full freedom, except apparently the payment of a certain tribute (Schafarik, ii, 532). They were only quiet a very short time, for the very next year we find them overrunning the land of the Stodorani and of Brandenburg, and making incursions into Saxony. On the death of Otho the Third and before his successor Henry the Second was everywhere acknowledged, the pressure of the Frank border-commanders aroused a fresh outbreak among the Obodriti, under their chiefs Michislaf and Mestiwoi the Second, in which they showed unusual energy. Christianity was trampled out, and the priests slaughtered, and tribute and service were withheld from the Emperor. This was in 1002. After the accession of Henry the Second, and when he was at war with Boleslaf of Poland, he made overtures to the Obodriti and Wiltzi. The former agreed to acknowledge his suzerainty, and to pay tribute, while the question of their again adopting Christianity was left over. The Wiltzi merely agreed to send a contingent to help the Emperor in his wars. This was in 1003, and afterwards the latter were faithful allies of the Franks in their Polish wars. In 1018 strife arose between the Obodriti and the Wiltzi in consequence of the refusal of the Obodritan chief Michislaf to render assistance to the latter against the Poles, which led to the Wiltzi being severely beaten, but this was a mere passing phase. We soon find the Obodriti, Wagrians, and Wiltzi driven to rebellion by the exactions of the Margrave Bernhard, and banishing the priests whom they had imprisoned at Schwerin, and largely reverting to paganism. Neither Henry nor the Saxon Duke Bernhard could make much way with them, and we are told that in 1022 the Emperor tried to persuade the leaders of these tribes (who had apparently meanwhile submitted) to pay tithes, but in vain, and the Bishop of Stargard retired in consequence or a lack of income to Hildesheim (Schafarik, ii, 534). Henry was succeeded by Conrad the Second. He allowed the Saxons to ill-use the Wiltzi, who thereupon went over to the Poles.

On the death of Michislaf, the ruler of the Obodriti, several princes succeeded to his heritage, of whom Anatrog favoured the heathens and Pribignief or Udo, Michislaf's son, the Christians. Two other Obodritan princes, Sederich and Ratibor, are also mentioned at this time. Pribignief or Udo was killed by a Saxon in 1031, whereupon his son, Gottschalk, whose mother was a daughter of the Danish King, and who had himself been brought up in a monastery at Luneburg, fell away from Christianity and fought with his Obodriti against the Germans, and afterwards went to live among the Danes, in whose service he fought for 11 years. On Gottschalk's departure, Ratibor seized the throne, but fell in 1042 with his eight sons in fighting against the Danes. Gottschalk was now reinstated with the help of the Danes. He encouraged the Christians, built churches and monasteries, and oppressed the heathens. Two new bishoprics were founded in 1051 at Ratibor and Rerig.

Grave discontent arose, however, in consequence of these changes, and Gottschalk was murdered at Lentschin, on the 7th of June, 1066. The bishops, the monks, and other Christians were slaughtered, churches and monasteries were overthrown, Gottschalk's widow, with his sons, Buthue and Henry, were sent back to Denmark. The leader of this outbreak was Pluso, Gottschalk's brother-in-law. A terrible struggle now ensued between the Obodriti and the Germans; the former ravaged Holstein and destroyed the town of Hamburg, and for 12 years the Duke Ordulf fought in vain against the Slaves, and was constantly beaten. Buthue, Gottschalk's son, tried in vain to secure the throne; he was killed in 1071. The Obodriti wished to be ruled by Kruko, a famous chief of the Rugians, to whom the Wiltzi had, in 1070, submitted. He reigned from 1066–1105, fought bravely against both the Germans and the Danes, and conquered Holstein.

During his reign the Isle of Rugen acquired a fresh importance among the Slaves and became the chief focus of their religion, but his rule was not undisturbed. In 1093 the Saxon Duke Magnus invaded the land of the Slaves and captured 14 towns, while on another side the Danish King Eric, as the patron of Gottschalk's son Henry, invaded the country and made both Wolin and Rugen tributary. Soon after, Henry himself landed on the coasts of Wagria, the Obodriti plundered the towns on the coast and forced the aged Kruko to surrender Plön and its neighbourhood to him. In 1105, he, in concert with Kruko's young wife Slavina, killed the old hero at a banquet near Plön, conquered the neighbouring towns in the districts of Wagria and Ratibor, put himself under the protection of the Duke of Saxony, and resigned Holstein to the Danes. On hear-

ing of this disgraceful proceeding, the Obodriti, together with the Kyshani and other tribes of the Wiltzi, took up arms, but they were defeated at Smilowopol (*i.e.* Binsfeld) by Duke Magnus. This was in 1105, and Henry, who was then at Lubeck, was proclaimed King. The Slaves as far as beyond the Oder, and even the Pomorians, were subject to him, but this did not last long.

In 1107 the Obodriti and Wiltzi rebelled, while the Wagrians remained faithful, and in the following years the Wiltzi again won their complete independence and are found under their own princes. Henry died in 1126, leaving two sons, Swatopluk and Kanute, who fought for supremacy, but the latter having died in 1127, Swatopluk remained sole ruler from 1127–1129, and overcame the Obodriti and the Kyshani. Thereby he aroused the opposition of the Rani, who in 1128 destroyed his town of Lubek (Bukowec). Soon after, he was killed with his son Zwenik or Zwenko. On the extinction of the family of Gottschalk, the Danish Prince Knut Laiward raised pretensions to the sceptre of the Slaves, which were acknowledged by Lothaire of Saxony. He determined to subject the Obodritan princes Prebislaf and his grandson, Niklot, but meanwhile as he was preparing for a more ambitious venture against the Wiltzi and Pomorani he was killed by Magnus, the King of Gotland, in 1131. He was succeeded by Pribislaf and Niklot, who strove with all their might for the preservation of the old faith and the old customs. They were not long at peace, but had to struggle against powerful neighbours. Niklot died heroically in 1160, fighting against Henry the Lion, and with him fell the last prop of the Slaves in these districts.

Let us now turn to the Sorabians, and track out their story. Fredegar is the first author who mentions these Northern Serbs. In describing the struggle of the Eastern Franks with the famous Bohemian hero, Samo, who first freed his country from the yoke of the Avars, he tells us that after the battle of Wogast in which the Franks were so badly beaten and which was fought in the year 630, many of the Winidi made an irruption into the Frankish borders, and he tells us further that Dervan, the leader of the Surbian race, which was of the stock of the Slaves, and was formerly subject to the Franks, submitted with his kingdom to Samo (Fredegar ed. Guizot, ii, 226). Thunmann, Gebhard, and others have looked upon these Serbians as the inhabitants of Lusatia, which I think is probable. Schafarik argues that this could not be, because it is said they were subject to the Franks, who had no authority in Lusatia, and he argues that Dervan ruled in the later Serbian district between the Saale and the Elbe. Our authorities are so exceedingly

scanty for the history of the sixth and seventh centuries in these parts that we really do not know how far east the Franks had authority before the campaign of Samo, and I am disposed to think that they were accepted as suzerains to a considerable distance beyond the Elbe, which would explain the statement of Constantine Porphyrogenitus that White Croatia bordered on the Franks; and we have the positive statement of Vibius Sequester, who wrote in the sixth century, to the effect that the Suevi and the Servitii or Serbs were separated by the Elbe, he says: "Albis Germaniæ Suevos a Servitiis dividit mergitur in Oceanum." Here is no mention of the Saale. The same conclusion follows from the accounts of the attack of the Avars on the Franks in 562, where we read that the Frankish territory then extended to the Elbe (Schafarik, ii, 510). It is true that the Serbians had reached the Saale in the end of the eighth century, but it is far more probable that in the seventh they were bounded on the west by the Elbe, as Vibius Sequester says. They perhaps crossed the Elbe as settlers after the Avarian invasion of 562-563. Eginhardt, writing of the year 782, speaks of the Saale as then dividing the Thuringians and the Sorabi, and tells us the latter lived between the Saale and the Elbe, and in 782 made an incursion into the borders of the Thuringians and Saxons, who were their neighbours. The Serbians in fact now occupied a large district on both sides of the Middle Elbe. I will now trace out the history of these Serbs.

In 782 we are told by Eginhardt that news was taken to the Emperor that the Sorabian Slaves, who lived between the Elbe and the Saale, had entered the land of the Thuringians and Saxons which bordered on them, for purposes of plunder, and had laid waste several districts. He thereupon sent Adalgisus, his chamberlain, and Gailo, the master of the horse, and Worad, the count-palatine, with some Franks and Saxons to punish them. When these commanders entered the borders of Saxony they found that the Saxons had been incited to rebel again by Widukind: they accordingly turned aside against the latter (Eginhardt Annals, Pertz, i, 163; Ann. Laur. *id.*, i, 162). In 789, when Charlemagne marched against the Wiltzi, we are told that there went with him some of the Slavi called Suurbi, as well as the Obodriti under their chief, Witzan (Ann. Laur. Pertz, i, 174).

In 805 Charlemagne sent a large army to lay waste Bohemia. This army was divided into four divisions, one of these marched through the districts of Werinofelda (*vide supra*) and Demelchion (*i.e.* the Gau of the Daleminzi). Semela, who ruled there, was defeated and gave his two sons as hostages. After this, this division went to Fergunna, a "gau" on the river Eger in Bohemia (Schafarik, ii, 606). Having been joined by other

troops, they devastated the district of Camburgh on the Elbe. Another army went to Magdeburg and pillaged the gau of Genewara (Chron. Moiss., Pertz, i, 308).

The next year Charlemagne again sent his son Charles against these Slaves of the Upper Elbe. He entered the district of Werinofelda, where a battle was fought, in which Miliduoch, the chief of the Suurbi, was killed. The country was laid waste, whereupon the other Slave chiefs sent in their submission and gave hostages. Two towns were ordered to be built to overawe them, one north of the Elbe opposite Magdeburgh, the other in the eastern part of the Saale, near Halle. After this, the Franks returned home again (Chron. Moiss., Pertz, i, 308; Enhardus, *id.*, 193). In a capitulary of 807, we find provisions in regard to the preparations to be made in case the Bohemians or Sorabians should prove hostile (Schafarik, ii, 519, note 6).

Charlemagne died in 814. In Eginhardt's list of the nations he subdued, the Sorabi are mentioned (Pertz, ii, 451). In 816 his son Louis ordered the Franks and Saxons to march against the Sorabi (Eginhardt Annals, *id.*, i, 203). In 820 the Franks fought with Liudiwit, King of "the Eastern Slaves," whom Schafarik identifies with the Sorabi. To the Convention of 822, held at Frankfort, the Sorabi, with the other Eastern Slaves, sent envoys and presents; at the similar meeting at Ingelheim, in May, 826, Tunglo, the chief of the Sorabi, with Ceadrag of the Obodriti, were accused of malpractices. They were ordered to appear in October, when Tunglo having surrendered his son as a hostage, was allowed to return home again (*id.*, 215). The quarrels of Louis with his sons apparently induced an uneasy feeling on the frontier, and in 839 we find the Emperor ordering the Saxons to march against the Sorabi and Wiltzi, who had recently burnt some of the towns on the Saxon march. The Saxons, we are told, thereupon marched against the Sorabi called Colodici, as far as Kosinesburg (according to Leutsch the modern Guetz or Quetz). The Sorabi were defeated, and their chief, Cimusclus (Czimislaw), fell in the struggle (Prud. of Troyes, Pertz, i, 434, 436; Schafarik, ii, 522). The foundation of the bishopric of Bamberg took place in 834, and was a notable event in the history of the spread of Christianity among the Slaves. By the Treaty of Verdun, made in 843 between the sons of Louis, Germany, with the suzerainty over the Polabian Slaves, fell to Louis the German. This led to outbreaks on the frontier, and in 846 we find Louis marching against the Slaves beyond the Elbe and the Bohemians (Annales Xantenses, Pertz, xi, 228; Prud. of Troyes, Pertz, i, 442). In 849 we read of a Thacolf, the governor of the Sorabian March (dux Sorabici limitis), who had

a great reputation among the Slaves since he was well versed in their laws and customs (Fulda Annals, Pertz, i, 366). From some of the Fulda deeds it seems he had property in one of the Sorabian "gaus" (Meissen) and probably also in Bohemia. He is called "Tacgolfus de Bohemia comes" in one deed (Schafarik, ii, 523, note 4). In 851 we again find the Sorabi invading the Frank borders, and Louis marching against them. Having wasted their country, they were constrained by impending famine to submit; as the chronicler says, "they were subdued by hunger rather than by the sword" (*id.*, Pertz, i, 367). In 855 Louis was much disturbed by the attacks of the Slaves (Prud. of Troyes, *id.*, i, 449), and the next year he marched an army through the country of the Sorabi, whose chiefs joined him, and with their help he overcame the Daleminci, whom he made tributary and compelled to give hostages; thence he went among the Bohemians and subdued some of their chiefs. In this expedition he seems to have lost a great number of his men; one author says the larger part of his army (Fulda Annals, Pertz, i, 370; Prud. Trec. *id.*, 450). In 857 we read of the Sorabian Prince Zestibor offering refuge to a fugitive chief from Bohemia (Fulda Ann. *id.*, 370). In 858 an army was sent under Thacolf against the Sorabi, who were rebellious (*id.* 371). Later in the year news arrived that the Sorabi, having put to death his *protégé*, their chief, Zestibor, meditated rebelling. (*Id.*, 237.)

In 869 we read how the Sorabi and Siusli, having united with the Bohemians and other neighbouring tribes wasted the Thuringian borders, and killed some people there. Louis sent his son with the Thuringians and Saxons against the Sorabi, whom he defeated, and killed a great number of them, and severely punished the Bohemian contingent which had joined them (Fulda Annals, *id.*, i, 381). Hincmar tells a different story: he says that Louis obtained peace from the Winidi on certain conditions (*i.e.*, he had to sacrifice something) and sent his sons to ratify it, while he himself remained in a weak condition at Ratisbon (*id.*, i, 485). In 873 Thacolf, the ruler of the Sorabian march, died. The next year the Sorabi and Siusli rebelled; Raculf, Thacolf's son, and Archbishop Liutbert marched against them, crossed the Saale, wasted their lands, and restored them to their former subjection (Fulda Annals, *id.*, i, 385). In 880 the Margrave Poppo marched against the Bohemians, Serbians, and Daleminzi. This official had apparently ruled with a heavy hand, for some years after we find he was deprived, to the great relief of the Serbians, who sent to thank the Emperor (Schafarik, ii, 525). Meanwhile, the Serbs east of the Elbe united themselves with the Bohemians, and for some time formed part of the dominions of

the great Moravian ruler Swentopulk (Schafarik, ii, 525). We have, in fact, reached a period when the empire founded by the Carlovingians, was *in extremis*, and when the German borders were much curtailed, the Elbe now forming their frontier from Bohemia to the sea. In 908 the Margrave Burkhardt, who could not make head against the Slaves beyond the Elbe, was killed in an encounter with them, while the Saxon Duke, Otho, the father of the later Emperor Henry, fought against the Daleminci in the same year. He was only able to add a small part of the Sorabian land to his dominions (Schafarik, ii, 525). When his son Henry succeeded to the crown of Germany, things entirely altered, and the Slaves were relentlessly conquered and incorporated. The war began in 921 with indecisive results. The following year, Henry marched into the land of the Milciani, whom he compelled to pay tribute, while he destroyed the town of Lubuzua (now Lebus) between Dahme and Schlieben (Schafarik, ii, 526). In 927, Henry suddenly entered the land of the Stodorani, captured their stronghold of Branibor, and made their princes tributary. He then passed into the land of the Daleminci, and captured their town of Grona (according to Leutsch, the modern Yahne, while Wersebe identifies it with Gruna), and having entered Bohemia, returned thence to Saxony in triumph (Schafarik, ii, 527). In 932 the Hungarians made an invasion of Thuringia, and passed in doing so through the land of the Daleminci. Henry's last campaign was against the Ukri, a branch of the Wiltzi, whom he in 934 compelled to pay tribute. (*Id.*)

About the year 960, the Saxon Count, Wichman, who was more or less of an outlaw, fled, first to the Danes, then to the Slaves at the mouth of the Oder. He then entered the service of his patron, the Margrave Gero, and made several attacks against the Lusatians, Milciani, Pomeranians, and Poles. In 963, Gero having been joined by a mercenary army of Slaves secured by Wichman, broke into Lusatia, and the land of the Milciani, who had sided with the Poles, defeated the Polish Prince, Michislaf, subdued the Lusatians and Milciani, and compelled the Polish princes to hold the land between the Warthe and the Bober as a German fief. Gero died in 965 (Schafarik, ii, 530). The Polabian Slaves having been more or less subdued, the Emperor Otho founded the Archbishopric of Magdeburg, with the subordinate sees of Merseburg, Zeitz (later Naumburg), and Meissen; the last in 968. We are told he knew both Latin and Slavic: "*Romana lingua Slavonicaque loqui sciebat, sed rarum est, quod earum uti dignaretur*" (Widukind, Schafarik, ii, 531, note 5). In 983, shortly before the death of Otho the Second, we find the Bohemians under the

Saxon Count, Dedo, making an invasion as far as Zeitz, which they laid waste, together with several towns and monasteries, as far as Magdeburg (Schafarik, ii, 533). A bloody fight at the River Tonger, in which 60,000 Slaves took part, was really undecided, although the Germans claimed the victory, and for many years a large part of the Slaves were practically independent. In 986, Otho the Third conquered the Stodorani, and in 992 recovered Brandenburg through the treason of a Saxon deserter.

In 1002 the Polish ruler Boleslaf Chrobry (*i.e.*, the brave) invaded the district of Meissen, and ravaged Lusatia and the country of the Milciani. This war continued for some time and eventually Boleslaf succeeded in annexing to his dominions the district of Lubus, Lusatia, the country of the Milciani and a part of Sorabia as far the Black Elster. (*Id.*, 534.)

In 1030 the Poles conquered Brandenburg, and the land of the Stodorani, which they held until 1101 (*id.*) In that year the Margrave Udo crossed the Elbe, conquered Magdeburg, and re-introduced Christianity there and in the neighbourhood (*id.*, 537), but this was only a transient success, and the old faith reinstated itself, while the Slavic nationality continued long unsophisticated. Albert the Bear undertook a fruitless campaign against them in 1136 and 1137, but we are now reaching a great turn in their fortunes. In 1157 Albert captured Brandenburg, conquered the Brizani and Stodorani, and gave a death-blow to an independent Slave nationality between the Elbe and the Oder. The Wiltzi, living on the Oder, became subject to Poland as early as 1121, and were the objects of Bishop Otho the First of Bamberg's missionary campaign in 1124–1129; and when at length the Danish King Valdemar, with Bishop Absolom, conquered the sacred island of Rugen and the Temple of Arkrona, the last traces were effaced of an independent Slave race between the Oder and the Elbe. A similar fate overtook the Sorabians living between the Saale, the Elbe, and the mountains separating Bohemia and Saxony. They had been defeated in two attempts which they made against Henry the Fowler in 922 and 927 to regain their freedom; their Germanization was vigorously prosecuted, especially after the foundation of the bishoprics of Meissen and of Zeitz (968). We find German towns being incessantly built and planted with German colonists while German officers were appointed over the gaus, who were subjected in 929 to the Margrave of Meissen. The most important of these Margraves were—Dedo, who was deposed in 953; Gunter, who reigned till 973; Riddag till 984; Ėkkihård, a hard and warlike man who subdued the Milciani about 1000 A.D.; Herman

till 1032. At the beginning of the eleventh century, Conrad of Wettin was Margrave of Meissen. He extirpated the nationality of the Sorabians on this side of the Elbe by craft and with the sword. Beyond the Elbe, and in the later Lusatia, the Serbs had a better fate: sometimes independent, sometimes, as under the great Swentopolk, subject to Bohemia and Moravia. According to Dithmar, Henry the Fowler made them tributary in 922, but this tribute was very small, and was only paid for a short time. Soon after we find the Serbs entirely independent; the campaign which Henry in 927 had prosecuted against the Serbs west of the Elbe, did not affect *them*. When at length they were again compelled by the German Margraves to pay tribute, this was very slight, and they retained their manners and customs. During the war between King Otho the First and Boleslaf of Bohemia in 936, in which the Milciani and Lusatians were in alliance with the Bohemians, the Serbs were again subdued by the Germans. In 968 they were divided between the Margrave and the Bishop of Meissen. During the bloody war between Otho the Third and the Lusatians in 994, in which nearly all the Polabian Slaves took a part, the Sorabians remained quiet. Soon after, their country became the scene of a prolonged strife between the Poles, the Germans, and the Bohemians. In 1002 the Margrave Ekkihard conquered the land of the Milciani in order to prevent the Pole Boleslaf Chrobry from doing so. But the same year, the latter not only over-ran this district and Lusatia, but also defended the land from the Oder to the Black Elster against the attacks of the Germans. This struggle was repeated in 1003 and 1004, 1011, etc., and indeed until his death. During the interregnum in Poland, the Germans again in 1030 conquered these countries; but in the course of the eleventh century they were again for a short time under the Bohemian rule.

When the German authority was reimposed over these districts, the Sorabians were treated more considerably than the other Slaves, partly because they had already become Christian under their Polish and Bohemian masters, and partly because it was feared they might again go over to the latter. They accordingly preserved considerable traces of their language and nationality, which were only effaced in comparatively recent times.

Schafarik has collected an interesting chain of evidences to show that the continual outbreaks and apparently ruthless character of the Slaves on the Elbe were due to the oppression they suffered from the German frontier commanders rather than to their disposition, which, like that of the Slaves elsewhere, was generally of a peaceful and quiet character.

Adam of Bremen, who was surely an unbiassed witness, says:—"Audivi etiam . . . populos Slavorum jam dudum procul dubio facile converti posse ad Christianitatem, nisi Saxonum obstitisset avaritia, quibus mens pronior est ad pensiones vectigalium, quam ad conversionem gentium. Nec attendunt miseri, quantum suæ cupiditatis luant periculum, qui Christianitatem in Slavania primo per avaritiam turbaverunt, deinde per crudelitatem subjectas ad rebellandum coegerunt, et nunc salutem eorum, qui credere vellent pecuniam solam exigendo, contemnunt . . . a quibus si tantum fidem posceremus, et illi jam salvi essent et nos certe essemus in pace." (*Op. cit.*, iii, 25; Schafarik, ii, 542.)

Helmold has quite a number of passages supporting the same view, from which I will abstract two; he says in one place: "Principes (Germanorum) pecuniam inter se partiti sunt. De Christianitate nulla fuit mentio. . . unde cognosci potest Saxonium insatiabilis avaritia, qui cum inter gentes ceteras barbaris contiguas præpolleant armis et usu militiæ, semper proniores sunt tributis augmentandis, quam animabus domiro conquiendis. Decor enim Christianitatis, sacerdotum instantia, jam dudum in Slavia convaluisse, si Saxonum avaritia non præpedisset" (*op. cit.*, c. 21). Again: "Principes nostri tanta severitate grassantur in nos, ut propter vectigalia et servitutem durissimam melior sit nobis mors quam vita . . . Quotidie emungimur et premimur usque ad ex exinanitionem. Quomodo ergo vacabimus huic religioni novæ, ut ædificemus ecclesias et percipiamus baptismum, quibus quotidiana indicitur fuga? si tamen locus esset, quo diffugere possemus. Trans-euntibus enim Travenam, ecce similis calamitas illic est; venientibus ad Panim fluvium, nihilominus adest. Quid ergo restat, quam ut omissis terris feramur in mare et habitemus cum gurgitibus," etc. (*id.*, ch. 83). In a document of 1285, given by Helmold, we find the following ruthless sentence: "Velimus et debeamus omnes Slavos et cives, eandem nunc villam (Velitz) inhabitantes, eliminare . . . sine omni spe reversionis," etc., etc. (Schafarik, ii, 542 and 543, note 2.)

There can be small doubt that, as Schafarik urges, the reason why Christianity made such little progress among the Polabian Slaves, was because it was so Erastian in character, and was deemed, as it is still deemed in China, to be a weapon of political propaganda, and we accordingly find that so long as the Slaves in this district retained their nationality they also clung to their old faith. The great preservers of this nationality were the old religion and the old language. In order to prosecute their work of evangelization we are told how the clergy learnt the Slavic tongue. Among those who are

recorded as knowing it were Boso and Werner, bishops of Merseburgh, the former before 971, the latter before 1101, as well as the priest Bruno, who flourished about 1156. The first of these, according to Dithmar, also knew how to write Slavic, and taught his converts how to sing the "Kyrie Eleison." This phrase we are told the Slaves scornfully corrupted into "we kri olsa," i.e. "the alder in the thickets." Dithmar himself seems to have known something of Slavic, judging from a number of his explanations of names of places, which are not, however, always happy. According to the Merseburgh Chronicle, books were also composed in Slavic to assist those who wished to learn the language. Helmold tells us that Gottschalk, the Obodritan prince, preached in Slavic, and translated the addresses of the German missionaries into the same language. Bishop Otho, who spread the gospel in Pomorania between the years 1124 and 1129, is said to have spoken Slavic so well that he was mistaken for a native. The Emperor Otho the First is also said to have been able to speak Slavic, also Arnulph Count of Wagria, who lived about 1140; but no Slavic documents from this area and of this date have come down to us except an interlinear series of glosses attached to a German's Latin Psalter of the eleventh and twelfth century, of which fragments were published by F. Wiggert.

This completes for the present our survey of a most difficult and complicated subject, interesting in every way to the political philosopher no less than the ethnologist. Few people realize the very small element of Teutonic origin that there is among the people of Prussia, and that the race which is now dominant in Germany is very largely indeed of Slavic origin. East of the Elbe nearly all the labouring population of the country districts is probably Slav. The aristocracy and land-owners are no doubt Germans by pedigree, being descended from the Teutonic Knights and later immigrants. The citizens of the towns are doubtless also very largely Germans, the plantation of whom in the land of the Slaves took place at a very early date.

Thus Helmold in recounting the doings of the famous Margrave Albert the Bear, after describing his conquest of the Brizani, Stodorani, and other tribes on the Elbe and the Havel, says: "Ad ultimum deficientibus sensim Slavis, misit Trajectum et ad loca Rheno contigua, insuper ad eos, qui habitant juxta oceanum et patiebatur vim maris, videlicet Hollandos, Selandos, Flandros, et adduxit ex eis populum magnum nimis et habitare eos fecit in urbibus et oppidis Slavorum" (Helm. i, 88).

Henry the Lion did the same among the Obodriti and

Wagrians: "Munitiones quas dux jure belli possederat in terra Obodritorum, cœperunt inhabitari a populis advenarum qui intraverant terram ad possidendum eam . . . Porro Henricus comes de Rasesburg quæ est in terra Polaborum adduxit multitudinem populorum de Westfalia ut incolerent terram Polaborum et divisit eis terram in funiculo distributionis" (Helm. i., 91; Zeuss, 659).

Again, in another passage: "Et præcepit dux Slavis qui remanserant in terra Wagirorum, Polaborum, Obodritorum, Kycinorum, ut solverent redditus episcopales . . . Et auctæ sunt decimationes in terra Slavorum, eo quod confluerent *de terris suis homines Teutonici ad incolendam terram spatiosam fertilem frumento, commodam pascuorum ubertate, abundantem pisce et carne et omnibus bonis*" (Helmold, i, 87; Zeuss, *loc. cit.*).

The story of the planting of Germans in Wagria is thus told: "Surrexit innumera multitudo de variis nationibus assumptisque familiis cum facultatibus, venerunt in terram Wagirensium ad comitem Adolfum, possessuri terram . . . Et primi quidem Holzatenses acceperunt sedes in locis tutissimis ad occidentalem plagam Sigeberg circa flumen Trabenam campestria quoque Zwentineveld et quicquid e rivo Sualen usque Agrimesou et lacum Plunensem extenditur. Dargunensem pagum Westfali, Utinensem Hollandi, Susle Fresi incoluerunt. Porro Plunensis adhuc desertus erat pagus. Aldenburg vero et Lutilenburg et cœteras; terras mari contiguas dedit Slavis, incolendas, factique sunt ei tributarii" (Helm. i., 57). Again, he says: "Reædificavit comes castrum Plunen et fecit illic civitatem et forum. Et recesserunt Slavi, qui habitant in oppidis circumjacentibus et venerunt Saxones et habitaverunt illic. Defeceruntque Slavi paulatim in terra" (*id.* i., 83). West of the Elbe, in some districts as I have said, as in the neighbourhood of Wuestrof, the Slaves retained their idiosyncrasies till a late date; but the main body of the citizens of the town was here, no doubt, German also.

Speaking of the Margrave Albert, we are told by Helmold: "Et australe littus Albiæ ipso tempore coeperunt incolere *Hollandienses, advenæ* ab urbe Salevelde (Saltwedele) omnem terram *palustrem atque campestram, terram quæ dicitur Balsemerlande et Marscinerlande*, civitates et oppida multa valde, usque ad saltum Bojemicum possederunt Hollandri. Scquidem has terras Saxones olim inhabitasse feruntur, tempore scilicet Ottonum, ut videri potest in antiquis aggeribus, qui congesti fuerant super ripas Albiæ in terra palustri Balsamiorum sed prævalentibus postmodum Slavis, Saxones occisi et terra a Slavis usque ad nostra tempora possessa. Nunc vero quia

Dominus duci nostro et ceteris principibus salutem et victoriam large contribuit, Slavi usquequaque protriti atque propulsi sunt et venerunt adducti de finibus oceani populi fortes et innumerabiles et obtinuerunt terminos Slavorum" (Helm. i., 81 ; Zeuss, 661 and 662).

After due allowance for all these and similar changes the fact remains that the great body of peasantry in Prussia east of the Elbe are of Slavic descent, and the fact that they have so largely lost their Slavic characteristics, and become merged in their conquerors, makes the problem of their ethnology none the less interesting because it is so tedious and difficult. Many of our conclusions about it, which are so largely indebted to the profound researches of Schafarik and Zeuss, are necessarily only tentative, and I hope to return to the subject when in a future paper we deal with the Wiltzi and Pomorians. Our next excursus will be concerning the Bulgarians.
